IMPERIAL BUREAU
OF
AGRICULTURAL PARASITOLOGY
(HELMINTHOLOGY)

VOLUME 1. Part 11. Pp. 257–288. 31st MARCH 1947

THE BULLETIN OF ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

The Official Organ of

THE INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION ON ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

Edited by

FRANCIS HEMMING, C.M.G., C.B.E.

Secretary to the International Commission

On the type of *Dinornis novae-zealandiae* Owen, 1843 (Class Aves, Order Dinornithiformes). By Gilbert Archey, *Director, Auckland Institute and Museum, Auckland, New Zealand* and R. S. Allan, *Canterbury University College, Christchurch, New Zealand* . . . . . p. 257

On the question whether the name *Corixa* Geoffroy, 1762 (Class Insecta, Order Hemiptera) satisfies the requirements of proviso (b) to Article 25 of the *Règles Internationales* and, if it is an available name, what is its type. By H. B. Hungerford, *Department of Entomology, University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kansas* . . . . . p. 258

Procedure proposed to be adopted by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature in considering the questions submitted by Professor H. B. Hungerford in regard to the name *Corixa* Geoffroy, 1762 (Class Insecta, Order Hemiptera). By Francis Hemming, C.M.G., C.B.E., *Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature* . p. 259

On the status of Martin (W.), 1793, *Fig. Descr. Petrif. Derbyshire*, and 1809, *Petrificata Derbiensia*. By J. Brookes Knight, *Department of Geology, Princeton University, Princeton, New Jersey* . . . . . p. 260

(*continued on back wrapper*)

LONDON:

Printed by Order of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature
and
Sold on their behalf by the International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature
at the Publications Office of the Trust
41, Queen's Gate, London, S.W.7.

1947

Price five shillings and seven pence

(All rights reserved)

INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION ON ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

COMPOSITION OF THE COMMISSION

A. The Officers of the Commission

President: Dr. Karl Jordan, Ph.D., F.R.S. (United Kingdom).
Vice-President: Dr. James L. Peters (U.S.A.).
Secretary: Mr. Francis Hemming, C.M.G., C.B.E. (United Kingdom).

B. The Members of the Commission

Class 1949

Senor Dr. Angel CABRERA (Argentina).
Mr. Francis HEMMING (United Kingdom) (*Secretary to the Commission*).
Dr. Karl JORDAN (United Kingdom) (*President of the Commission*).
Dr. Th. MORTENSEN (Denmark).
Dr. Joseph PEARSON (Australia).
Herr Professor Dr. Rudolf RICHTER (Germany).

Class 1952

Senhor Dr. Afranio do AMARAL (Brazil).
Professor James Chester BRADLEY (U.S.A.).
Professor Ludovico di CAPORIACCO (Italy).
Professor J. R. DYMOND (Canada).
Dr. James L. PETERS (U.S.A.) (*Vice-President of the Commission*).
Dr. Harold E. VOKES (U.S.A.).

Class 1955

Professor Dr. Hilbrand BOSCHMA (Netherlands).
Dr. William Thomas CALMAN (United Kingdom).
Professor Teiso ESAKI (Japan).
Professor Béla von HANKÓ (Hungary).
Dr. T. JACZEWSKI (Poland).
Dr. Norman R. STOLL (U.S.A.).

C. The Staff of the Secretariat in London

Secretary to the Commission: Mr. Francis Hemming, C.M.G., C.B.E.
Archivist: Mr. Francis J. Griffin, A.L.A.

D. The Address of the Commission

Secretariat of the Commission:
British Museum (Natural History), Cromwell Road, London, S.W. 7.

Publications Office of the Commission:
41, Queen's Gate, London, S.W. 7.

Personal address of the Secretary:
83, Fellows Road (Garden Flat), London, N.W. 3.

ON THE TYPE OF *DINORNIS NOVAE-ZEALANDIAE* OWEN, 1843 (CLASS AVES, ORDER DINORNITHIFORMES)

By GILBERT ARCHEY

(Director, Auckland Institute and Museum, Auckland, New Zealand),

and

R. S. ALLAN

(Canterbury University College, Christchurch, New Zealand).

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)136.)

We are writing to ask for a ruling or an *Opinion* from the Commission as to what specimen should be regarded as the type of Owen's species *Dinornis novae-zealandiae*, in connection with which we give the four relevant references as follows :—

(1) In July 1843, *Proc. zool. Soc. Lond.* **11** (120) : 8, 10, Owen published the name *Dinornis novae-zealandiae*, the species being based on a femur, a tibio-tarsus and a tarso-metatarsus described in that order.

These three specimens are the co-types, and are the f12 (femur), t2 (tibia) and m3 (metatarsus) of No. (3) below.

(2) In March 1844, *Proc. zool. Soc. Lond.* **11** (129) : 144, Owen published the names *Dinornis struthoides* and *Dinornis ingens*, both *nomina nuda*.

(3) In June 1844, *Trans. zool. Soc. Lond.* **3** (3) : 244–249, Owen published in full the paper of which No. (2) above was a preliminary notice.

He ignored his earlier proposal of *Dinornis novae-zealandiae* and described instead two species :—

page 244. *Dinornis struthoides*, the holotype of which is the metatarsus m3.

page 247. *Dinornis ingens*, the holotype of which is the tibio-tarsus t2.

On page 249 he referred the femur f12 to *Dinornis struthoides*. It was not, however, a co-type of *Dinornis struthoides*.

(4) In 1891, Lydekker, *Cat. foss. Birds Brit. Mus.* : 224, employed the name *Dinornis novae-zealandiae*, and on page 224, footnote, and again on page 227 designated the tibia t2 (type of *Dinornis ingens* Owen) as the lectotype of *Dinornis novae-zealandiae* Owen.

On page 244 he cited *Dinornis struthoides* Owen, accepting the tarso-metatarsus m3 as its type.

The point at issue is whether Owen's designation of the tarso-metatarsus m3 as the type of *Dinornis struthoides*, and of the tibio-tarsus t2 as the type of *Dinornis ingens*, invalidates Lydekker's subsequent selection of t2 as the lectotype of *Dinornis novae-zealandiae* Owen.

ON THE QUESTION WHETHER THE NAME *CORIXA* GEOFFROY, 1762 (CLASS INSECTA, ORDER HEMIPTERA) SATISFIES THE REQUIREMENTS OF PROVISO (b) TO ARTICLE 25 OF THE *RÈGLES INTERNATIONALES* AND, IF IT IS AN AVAILABLE NAME, WHAT IS ITS TYPE

By H. B. Hungerford.

(*Department of Entomology, University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kansas.*)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)137.)

I desire an *Opinion* concerning the following nomenclatorial questions :—

(1) Louis Geoffroy in, 1762, *Histoire abregée des Insectes qui se trouvent aux environs de Paris*, **1** : 478, proposed the genus *Corixa*. Is this generic name to be accepted as of 1762 ?

(2) If Geoffroy's work is considered binary, what is to be considered the type of the genus *Corixa* Geoffroy ?

According to *Opinion* 65,[1] the case of a genus based upon erroneously determined species should be submitted.

This is such a case. Geoffroy writes :—

1. CORIXA Planch. 9, fig. 7.
Linn. Syst. Nat. edit. 10, p. 439, n. 2, Notonecta striata.

However, the drawing on plate 9 is natural size and his description " Longueur 5½ lignes, Largeur 2 lignes " represents a species far too large for *Notonecta striata* Linnaeus, 1758, *Syst. Nat.* (ed. 10) **1** : 439, and not congeneric with it. Until recently the species figured and described by Geoffroy has been known as *Corixa geoffroyi* Leach, 1817, *Trans. linn. Soc. Lond.* **12** (1) : 17.

Reutter, 1888, considered Geoffroy's work of 1762 invalid since, in his view, it did not as a whole follow the binary system of nomenclature.

Kirkaldy, 1900, believed that Geoffroy's work should be accepted and claimed that Müller, 1764, in his *Fauna Ins. Fridrichsdalina* also validated Geoffroy's generic names in a table comparing Geoffroyian and Linnean types.

Mr. W. E. China (1938, *Ent. mon. Mag.* **74** : 34–39) questioned whether Müller's work validated the Geoffroyian generic names, because Müller did not mention species in his table of genera, although the remainder of the book is binominal. Perhaps we should have an *Opinion* on this point.

Mr. China assumes that the type of *Corixa* Geoffroy, which he accepts as from 1785, is *Corixa geoffroyi* Leach, 1818 (= *Sigara punctata* Illiger, 1807, *in* Rossi, *Fauna etrusc.* (ed. 2) : 354).

That is to say, he accepts as the type of *Corixa* Geoffroy the species figured by Geoffroy and not *Notonecta striata* Linnaeus, 1758, the species cited by Geoffroy. The question should be settled officially.

As far as I can see, *Notonecta striata* Linnaeus remains a contender for consideration as the type of the genus *Corixa* Geoffroy, until :—

(1) the validity of the Geoffroyian generic names is settled ; and

(2) the genotype of *Corixa* Geoffroy is fixed as provided in *Opinion* 65.

[1] The question of genera based upon erroneously determined species was further considered by the International Commission at Lisbon in 1935. For the text of the decision then taken (Lisbon Session, 2nd Meeting, Conclusion 23), see 1943, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **1** : 23–25. That decision has since been embodied in *Opinion* 168 (1945, *Opinions and Declarations rendered by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature* **2** : 411–430).

For many years I have been aware of the nomenclatorial questions cited above, but have been content not to raise them. Naturally, I would prefer to see *Corixa geoffroyi* Leach declared the type of *Corixa*, but I want a ruling to set the matter at rest.

PROCEDURE PROPOSED TO BE ADOPTED BY THE INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION ON ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE IN CONSIDERING THE QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY PROFESSOR H. B. HUNGERFORD IN REGARD TO THE NAME *CORIXA* GEOFFROY, 1762 (CLASS INSECTA, ORDER HEMIPTERA)

By Francis Hemming, C.M.G., C.B.E.

(*Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature.*)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)137.)

The foregoing application by Professor Hungerford deals primarily with certain questions of special concern to hemipterists, namely (i) the date as from which the name *Corixa* Geoffroy is to be accepted as available under Article 25 of the Code and (ii) the species which is to be accepted as the type of that genus.

As Professor Hungerford points out, the first of these questions raises also a much broader question and one which is of concern to specialists in a large number of Orders in the Class Insecta, namely the question whether Geoffroy, 1762, *Hist. abreg. Ins.* is a work which satisfies the requirements of proviso (*b*) to Article 25 of the Code. For a note on the procedure proposed to be adopted by the Commission in considering the important issues raised by this general problem, see the note printed on pages 98–101 above.

Considerable inconvenience and, owing to the repetition involved, unnecessary expense has been incurred in the past when two distinct (though allied) problems have been considered by the Commission as a single case. In order to avoid these difficulties on the present occasion, specialists who desire to offer observations both on (i) the status of Geoffroy, 1762, *Hist. abreg. Ins. Paris*, and also (ii) on the special problems connected with the name *Corixa* are particularly requested to assist the work of the Commission by furnishing separate communications on these subjects.

ON THE STATUS OF MARTIN (W.), 1793, *FIG. DESCR. PETRIF. DERBYSHIRE*, AND 1809, *PETRIFICATA DERBIENSIA*

By J. Brookes Knight.

(*Department of Geology, Princeton University, Princeton, New Jersey.*)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)147.)

I wish to have an *Opinion* from the International Commission on the status of the names in Martin (W.), 1809, *Petrificata Derbiensia; or Figures and descriptions of petrifactions collected in Derbyshire.*

Martin seems to have been familiar with Linnean binominal nomenclature (see *Petrif. Derb.*: footnote bottom page opposite Plate 41) and yet he consistently employs for fossils trinominals such as *Conchyliolithus Anomites productus*, where, for example, he calls *Conchyliolithus* the " genus ", *Anomites* the " family ", and *productus* the " species ". He even employs designations of four terms such as *Conchyliolithus Nautilites Ammonites listeri*. He explains his system of terms, I am uncertain as to whether or not they are names, in a separate work published at about the same time and referred to in *Petrif. Derb.* on page VIII. This separate work is: *Outlines of an attempt to establish a knowledge of extraneous fossils on scientific principles*, 1809.

To make my question more precise :—

(1) Have the names that Martin considered " generic ", for example *Conchyliolithus* any standing in nomenclature?

(2) Have the names that Martin considered as pertaining to " families ", for example *Anomites, Ammonites, Nautilites*, any standing in nomenclature from Martin's usage of them, and more specifically standing as generic names?

(3) Have the names that Martin considered as " specific " any standing in nomenclature as trivial names?

Later authors have almost universally adopted Martin's trivial names, citing them from *Petrificata Derbiensia*, 1809. His terms of higher rank have been universally ignored. His earlier usage of some of the names may help throw some light on the matter. Thus in 1809 he uses the name *Conchyliolithus Helicites catillus*. In 1793 (Martin (W.), *Figures and descriptions of petrifactions collected in Derbyshire* (which is not his *Petrificata Derbiensia* of 1809, but a predecessor of that work)) he describes this species for the first time as " CONCHYLIOLITHUS (catillus) HELICIS "—followed by a Latin diagnosis. It is perfectly clear here from the discussion in English in the following paragraph that he does not here regard " *Conchyliolithus* " as a name but merely a designation for fossilised shells. He begins his English discussion: " A fossil shell, of the genus Helix ". Thus to rewrite the name in its correct form and in the nominative [2] case we would have " *Helix catillus* ". Are the trivial names that appear in Martin, 1793, for example *catillus* as cited above, valid?

[2] See *Opinion* 183 (1944, *Opinions and Declarations rendered by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature* **3**: 13–24).

ON THE QUESTION WHETHER EIGHT GENERIC NAMES IN THE ORDER LEPIDOPTERA (CLASS INSECTA) COMMONLY ACCEPTED AS HAVING BEEN FIRST PUBLISHED BY FABRICIUS IN 1807 WERE PUBLISHED BY ILLIGER EARLIER IN THE SAME YEAR

By Francis Hemming, C.M.G., C.B.E.

(*Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature.*)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)148.)

In volume 6 of the *Magazin für Insektenkunde* (*Illiger*), the title page of which is dated 1807, there appeared an article (pp. 277, 278) entitled "Die neueste Gattungs-Eintheilung der Schmetterlinge aus den Linnéischen Gattungen *Papilio* und *Sphinx*," to which was attached a synopsis (pp. 279–289) of the characters of 49 genera entitled "Schmetterlings-Gattungen. A. Nach Fabricii Systema Glossatorum Tom. I." The article itself was anonymous, but there is practically no doubt that it was written by Illiger. The synopsis of genera was, as the title shows, taken from Fabricius' unpublished *Systema Glossatorum*, and it is therefore perfectly correct to attribute to Fabricius the new generic names included therein and not to Illiger or whoever was the anonymous author of the article beginning on p. 277. M. Felix Bryk in 1938 edited a facsimile (published by the Verlag Gustav Feller, Neubrandenburg) of one of the two surviving proof copies of Fabricius' unpublished *Systema Glossatorum*, in which all the 49 genera mentioned in the synopsis given in Illiger's *Magazin* are given in a preliminary Key ("*Characteres Generum*"), which includes also a fiftieth name for a genus of butterflies (*Casinia* Fabricius) which did not appear in the synopsis in the *Magazin*.

2. In the issue dated 19th December 1807 of the *Allgemeine-Literatur Zeitung*, which, though normally treated as being of Jena, was in fact at this time published at Halle, there is an anonymous article written by Illiger, which contains a detailed review of the first 34 plates of the *Sammlung exotischer Schmetterlinge* published by Jacob Hübner. A facsimile of this article is given on pp. 43–45 of volume 2 of my *Hübner* published by the Royal Entomological Society of London in 1937. In this article each of the species figured on the 34 plates in question is considered critically, and, as explained in a preliminary note, the generic name according to the system of Fabricius is added. In the following table, I give the names of the species figured by Hübner, the number of the plate on which each species is so figured, the genus assigned to each species by Hübner, and the genus of the Fabrician system allotted to each species by Illiger in the review referred to above :—

Generic names applied to the species figured on the first 34 plates published of Hübner's *Samml. exot. Schmett.* by Illiger in his anonymous review of the species so figured which appeared in the issue of 19th December 1807 of the *Allgem. Lit. Ztg*, Halle [Jena].

Name of species.	Pl. no.	Generic name used by Hübner.	Generic name used in *Allgem. Lit. Ztg*, Halle [Jena].
aetolus	[102]	*Rusticus*	*Hesperia*
gnidus	[104]	*Rusticus*	*Helicopis*
demoleas [sic]	[116]	*Princeps*	*Papilio*
hellica	[141]	*Mancipium*	*Pontia*
fabius	[148]	*Consul*	*Brassolis* ?
licus	[150]	*Urbanus*	*Castnia*
thraso	[151]	*Urbanus*	*Thymele*
proteus	[155]	*Urbanus*	*Thymele*
niveus	[159]	*Urbanus*	*Thymele*
cymo	[2]	*Nereis*	*Hymenitis*
doto	[1]	*Nereis*	*Hymenitis*
neso	[5]	*Nereis*	*Hymenitis*
ninonia	[6]	*Nereis*	*Hymenitis*
polymnia	[7]	*Nereis*	*Hymenitis*
dianasa	[8]	*Nereis*	*Mechanitis*
eunice	[9]	*Nereis*	*Neptis*
vesta	[11]	*Nereis*	*Mechanitis*
thelxiope	[12]	*Nereis*	*Mechanitis*
thamar	[15]	*Nereis*	*Mechanitis*
dido	[17]	*Nereis*	*Mechanitis*
cora	[25]	*Lemnas* [sic]	*Euploea*
nemertes	[26]	*Lemnas* [sic]	*Euploea*
halimede	[27]	*Limnas*	*Eurybia*
leucosia	[29]	*Limnas*	*Nymphidium*
pharea	[32]	*Limnas*	*Emesis*
genutia	[21]	*Limnas*	*Euploea*
zygia	[35]	*Lemonias*	*Lemonias*
julia	[43]	*Dryas*	*Mechanitis*
vanillae	[44]	*Dryas*	*Mechanitis*
amphinome	[47]	*Hamadryas*	*Apatura*
astina	[56]	*Hamadryas*	*Brassolis*
themis	[60]	*Najas*	*Brassolis*
leonte	[79]	*Potamis*	*Brassolis*
leilaria	[200]	*Lars*	*Urania*

3. It will be seen from column 4 of the preceding table that Illiger distributed the 34 species in question among 17 of what he called genera of the Fabrician system. Of these genera 15 belong to the sub-order Rhopalocera and 2 to the sub-order Heterocera, although (as can be seen from the synopsis of Fabrician genera published in volume 6 of Illiger's *Magazin* and also from the unpublished *Systema Glossatorum* of Fabricius, discussed in paragraph 1 above) it is clear that both Illiger and Fabricius regarded these two genera as also belonging to what is now accepted as the sub-order Rhopalocera.

4. Two of the generic names used by Illiger in 1807 in the *Allgemeine-Literatur Zeitung* (namely *Papilio* and *Hesperia*) were published by other authors (Linnaeus and Fabricius respectively) long before 1807. These names are, therefore, not involved in the problem with which this paper is concerned.

5. Three of the names used by Illiger in the *Allgemeine-Literatur Zeitung* were not used by Fabricius in the paper published in volume 6 of Illiger's *Magazin*. These three names (*Eurybia*, *Hymenitis*, and *Lemonias*) are, therefore, also not involved in the present problem.

6. There are thus 12 names, the first publication of which may have occurred

either (i) in the *Allgemeine-Literatur Zeitung* (in which case they should be attributed to Illiger) or (ii) in volume 6 of Illiger's *Magazin* (in which case they should be attributed to Fabricius).

7. Each of the generic names published by Fabricius in volume 6 of Illiger's *Magazin* was accompanied with a short definition and these names accordingly satisfy the requirements of proviso (a) to Article 25 of the International Code. The names published by Illiger in the *Allgemeine-Literatur Zeitung* stand in an altogether different position. Illiger gave no description or definition of these genera and it is necessary, therefore, to consider whether he gave an " indication " for these genera within the meaning of that expression as used in Article 25. The meaning to be attached to that expression has been laid down by the International Commission in *Opinion* 1 (see 1944, *Opinions and Declarations rendered by the International Commission of Zoological Nomenclature* **1** : 73–86). Of the provisions in *Opinion* 1 relating to generic names, the only one under which any of the names published by Illiger in 1807 could qualify as having been published with an " indication " (and, therefore, as being available under Article 25) is the provision which lays it down that the " definite citation or designation of a type " is to be accepted as constituting an " indication ". As pointed out in NOTE 5 to *Opinion* 1 (1944, *ibid.* **1** : 79–82), it is clear from *Opinion* 17 that, where a genus is monotypical, it is to be deemed for this purpose to have been published with " definite citation or designation of a type ". In the case of the names published by Illiger in 1807 in the *Allgemeine-Literatur Zeitung*, it is necessary, therefore, to reject, as failing to satisfy proviso (a) to Article 25, any name published for a genus, for which no explanatory matter is given and in which two or more species were cited, none being specified as the type.

8. An examination of the table given in paragraph 2 above shows that 5 of the genera established by Illiger were cited with more than one contained species and must, therefore (for the reasons explained above), be rejected as not being available nomenclatorially as from the date of their publication by Illiger in the *Allgemeine-Literatur Zeitung*. The names which must be rejected on these grounds are : *Brassolis*; *Euploea*; *Hymenitis*; *Mechanitis*; and *Thymele*. Of these, all except *Hymenitis* were published by Fabricius in volume 6 of Illiger's *Magazin* and this accordingly becomes the undisputed place of their first publication. All 5 of these names cease to be involved in the problem dealt with in the present paper, since none of them was validly published both by Illiger (in the *Allgemeine-Literatur Zeitung*) and by Fabricius (in volume 6 of Illiger's *Magazin*).

9. It will be seen, therefore, that of the 17 generic names used by Illiger in the *Allgemeine-Literatur Zeitung* (i.e. the names enumerated in column 4 of the table given in paragraph 2 above), 9 are not affected by the question of the relative dates of publication of Illiger's article in the above journal and of the paper giving the list of Fabrician genera which appeared in volume 6 of Illiger's *Magazin*. Of these names, 2 were eliminated because they were published by previous authors (paragraph 4); 3 were eliminated because they were not included in the list given in volume 6 of Illiger's *Magazin* (paragraph 5); and 4 were eliminated because in the *Allgemeine-Literatur Zeitung* they were not published in such a way as to satisfy the requirements of Article 25 of the Code (paragraph 8). There remain therefore 8 generic names, the first publication of which may have been in (i) the *Allgemeine-Literatur Zeitung* or (ii) volume 6 of Illiger's *Magazin*. These names are :—*Apatura* ; *Castnia*; *Emesis*; *Helicopis*; *Neptis*; *Nymphidium*; *Pontia*; and *Urania*.

10. It is necessary therefore at this stage to consider what evidence, whether direct or indirect, is available to determine whether or not the article in volume 6 of Illiger's *Magazin* appeared before that in the *Allgemeine-Literatur Zeitung*; and therefore whether Fabricius is the author of the 8 names given in paragraph 9 above (as he would be in the former event) or whether Illiger through his review of Hübner's plates is the author of the 8 names in question (as would be the case in the latter event). This is not a matter of theoretical interest only, but is one of great practical importance, since in most cases the included species in the two papers are different, with the result that, if it proved to be the case that Illiger's review of Hübner's plates was published before the extract from Fabricius' *Systema* given in Illiger's *Magazin*, the types of the genera in question would need to be changed. The evidence available on the point at issue is given in the following paragraphs.

11. Illiger's review of Hübner's plates which appeared in the *Allgemeine-Literatur Zeitung* is known to have been published in 1807 on 19th December, since it was included in Number 303 of that journal which bears that date. As regards the article in Illiger's *Magazin*, the volume in question (vol. 6) is dated 1807, and in the absence of definite evidence to the contrary must be accepted as having been published in that year. There is no direct evidence as to what month in that year the portion concerned (pp. 277–289) was published.

12. In paragraph 1 above, I have shown that the title of the article in Illiger's *Magazin* expressly states (p. 277) that the genera (49 in number) given in the synopsis (pp. 279–289) represent the latest revision of the Linnean genera *Papilio* and *Sphinx*, and that the title to the synopsis shows that this revision was the work of Fabricius. Further, in the same paragraph, I have shown that at the time in 1807 when Fabricius finished the manuscript of his *Systema Glossatorum* he had slightly modified the ideas set out in the article in Illiger's *Magazin* and had increased the number of genera from 49 to 50. There can therefore be no doubt that the article in Illiger's *Magazin* was not only written but also passed for final printing on some date in 1807 prior to the date in the same year on which Fabricius wrote the manuscript of his *Systema Glossatorum*.

13. Illiger's unsigned article published in the 19th December 1807 issue of the *Allgemeine-Literatur Zeitung* was concerned only with the first 34 plates of Hübner's *Sammlung exotischer Schmetterlinge* and the genera of Fabricius are mentioned only incidentally in relation to the species figured by Hübner on the plates under review. Nevertheless of the 17 Fabrician genera among which (as shown in paragraph 2 above) the species figured on these 34 plates were distributed, there were no less than 3 genera which appeared neither in the article in volume 6 of Illiger's *Magazin* nor in the proof of Fabricius' *Systema Glossatorum*, both of which expressly claimed, as at the dates concerned, to set out the latest revision by Fabricius of the genera *Papilio* Linnaeus and *Sphinx* Linnaeus. There can therefore be no doubt whatever that Illiger's review of Hübner's plates published on 19th December 1807 in the *Allgemeine-Literatur Zeitung* was written, and therefore printed, subsequent to the date on which the paper in volume 6 of Illiger's *Magazin* was printed and passed for publication, and subsequent also to the date still later in 1807 on which Fabricius sent the manuscript of his *Systema Glossatorum* to the printer.

14. There thus remains one question only for consideration, namely the possibility that the Illiger *Magazin* article, though admittedly written before Illiger's review of the Hübner plates, was nevertheless actually published after the appearance of that review. Both are dated 1807 and the latter is dated 19th December of that year. In order therefore to sustain an argument

that these articles were published in 1807 in the reverse order to that in which they were written, it would be necessary to show (i) that the publication of vol. 6 of Illiger's *Magazin* was delayed until after 19th December 1807 and therefore took place during the twelve-day period from 20th December 1807 to 31st December 1807; and (ii) that, although by 19th December Fabricius had subdivided the Linnean genera *Papilio* and *Sphinx* into 53 genera (50 given in the proof of the *Systema Glossatorum* which was sent to the printer in 1807 prior to the date on which Illiger wrote his review of Hübner's plates, plus three genera the names of which appeared for the first time in the said review), both Fabricius, as author, and Illiger, as editor of the *Magazin*, allowed the publication of a paper which expressly claimed to give the latest particulars relating to Fabricius' system but which was in fact already out of date, in that it omitted 4 of the 53 genera which, on the hypothesis here under consideration, Fabricius had already adopted.

15. I must, however, add that in correspondence with me the late Dr. Foster H. Benjamin put forward the view that vol. 6 of Illiger's *Magazin* was published after the close of 1807 (although it bears the date of that year), and therefore that Illiger's review in the *Allgemeine-Literatur Zeitung* was published well before the synopsis of Fabricius' genera given in vol. 6 of Illiger's *Magazin*. Dr. Benjamin based this view upon the following considerations. In the first place, he considered that the fact that volumes 3 and 4 of Illiger's *Magazin* were not reviewed in the *Allgemeine-Literatur Zeitung* until the early part of 1807, and that vol. 5 was reviewed in the same journal later in that year indicated that for some reason the publication of the successive volumes of Illiger's *Magazin* was retarded and did not necessarily take place in the years given on the title pages of the volumes concerned. Dr. Benjamin then drew attention to the fact that in the case of one set of Illiger's *Magazin* preserved in the United States which appeared to be in contemporary binding, volumes 3 and 4 were bound in a single volume. From this he deduced that some cause—perhaps lack of funds—led to a delay in the distribution of vol. 3 with the result that that volume was not distributed until 4 was ready for distribution also. Dr. Benjamin then referred to the Reichard fire in which admittedly a large part of the stock of vol. 6 of Illiger's *Magazin* was destroyed. He stated that he was aware of three copies in the United States, which he accepted as originals, but he took the view that this volume was not distributed (*i.e.* was not published) in 1807 or indeed at any date sufficiently early to permit of it being reviewed by Illiger in the *Allgemeine-Literatur Zeitung*. In other words, according to this argument, this volume was not distributed at least until the end of 1808. Dr. Benjamin considered that, having regard to the fact that the *Allgemeine-Literatur Zeitung* was issued at intervals of three days only and that Illiger would be the first person in the world to have at his disposal for review purposes a copy of vol. 6 of his own *Magazin*, he would certainly have reviewed that volume if it had been published during the period in which he was writing reviews for the *Allgemeine-Literatur Zeitung*. Finally, Dr. Benjamin drew attention to the fact that the main text of vol. 4 of Latreille's *Gen. Crust. Ins.*, published in 1809, contained no reference to vol. 6 of Illiger's *Magazin*, while the addenda to the above volume of Latreille's work was full of such references. From this, Dr. Benjamin concluded that Latreille did not receive vol. 6 of Illiger's *Magazin* until about 1809, when it was too late for him to include any references thereto in the main portion of vol. 4 of his own work.

16. It is now necessary to examine the various arguments summarised in

the preceding paragraph. Dr. Benjamin, it should first be noted, attached great importance to the slow and spasmodic way in which Illiger reviewed his own *Magazin* in the *Allgemeine-Literatur Zeitung*, and to the fact that vol. 6 of the *Magazin* was never reviewed in it at all. It must be remembered, however, that the *Allgemeine-Literatur Zeitung* was primarily concerned with the reviewing of separate works and not with that of journals; and, insofar as journals were reviewed, it would not cause surprise if the reviewer (in this case Illiger) exhibited a certain modesty in reviewing a journal (in this case Illiger's *Magazin*) of which he was himself the editor, except perhaps when there was a shortage of other material and it was necessary to fill up a space. The point made by Dr. Benjamin that in one set of Illiger's *Magazin* preserved in the United States volumes 3 and 4 are bound in a single volume in what appears to be a contemporary binding, cannot mean more than that the original owner of that copy found it convenient to bind up these two volumes in this way, since there are numerous copies in Europe which equally appear to be in contemporary binding though volumes 3 and 4 are separately bound. In any case, the way in which the volumes of this work were bound depended on the choice of the purchaser and not upon Illiger, since there was certainly in this case no such thing as a publisher's binding. As regards the Reichard fire, there is no doubt that part of the stock of vol. 6 of Illiger's *Magazin* was destroyed in this way, but, judging from the number of complete sets of Illiger's *Magazin* extant in Europe, a considerable number of copies had either been sold before the fire took place or escaped destruction on that occasion. The evidence afforded by vol. 4 of Latreille's *Gen. Crust. Ins.* certainly shows almost beyond doubt that Latreille did not obtain a copy of vol. 6 of Illiger's *Magazin* until some time in 1809; but it throws no light upon the question of the date on which that volume of Illiger's *Magazin* was published. Indeed, when it is remembered that the Napoleonic wars were in full swing during the period in question, it is perhaps surprising to find that in 1809 a French naturalist was able to secure a copy of a German publication within two years of its publication. As regards the suggestion that perhaps Illiger found himself in financial difficulties—a suggestion supported by no concrete evidence whatever—it must be observed that vol. 6 of Illiger's *Magazin* is dated 1807 on the title page and therefore that the type at least must have been set up in that year. This being so, the main cost, that of printing, had already been incurred in 1807, and, if Illiger had been in financial difficulties, he would certainly not have delayed the actual publication of the volume on that account. On the contrary, his first consideration would have been to secure that publication took place at the earliest possible moment in order that through sales he might recoup himself to some extent at least in respect of the expenditure already incurred on printing.

17. The considerations advanced in the preceding paragraph appear to me to show, as conclusively as is possible in the absence of direct evidence, that there are no grounds for concluding that the publication of volume 6 of Illiger's *Magazin* was postponed until after the close of 1807. Nor do there appear to me to be any grounds for holding that the portion of volume 6 of Illiger's *Magazin* containing the list of Fabrician genera was published after the publication (on 19th December 1807) of Illiger's paper in the *Allgemeine-Literatur Zeitung*, which (as shown in paragraph 13 above) was undoubtedly written (even it was not published) after, and not before, the compilation of the list of Fabrician genera in volume 6 of Illiger's *Magazin*. I recognise, however, that these are no more than personal opinions on a question on which opinions

may differ. I recognise also that there is always a chance that, in spite of the care with which the early entomological literature has been examined by many workers, evidence may some day be found which may show that, in fact, the publication of volume 6 of Illiger's *Magazin* was delayed and in consequence that the list of Fabrician genera contained in that volume was not published until after the publication of Illiger's review in the *Allgemeine-Literatur Zeitung*.

18. The fact that there is a doubt regarding the place where these important generic names were first published and in consequence that there is a doubt regarding the types of the genera concerned introduces a serious element of uncertainty into the nomenclature of some of the most representative genera in the sub-order Rhopalocera. Further, the risk that the Illiger names may at any time be found to have been published before their Fabrician counterparts means that there is a serious contingent risk of confusion arising in the nomenclature of the groups concerned. How serious the confusion would be if the Illiger names were to take priority over those proposed by Fabricius can be gauged from the following examples :—

(1) If *Neptis* Illiger, 1807, were found to be an older name than *Neptis* Fabricius, 1807, the type of the genus bearing the name "*Neptis*" would cease to be *Papilio aceris* Esper, [1783], and would become *Nereis eunice* Hübner, [1807], the sole species placed by Illiger in the genus *Neptis*. In other words, the generic name *Neptis* would cease to apply to the very large group of Old World species universally referred to the genus *Neptis* and would be transferred to the equally well-known New World genus now universally known as *Phyciodes* Hübner, [1819], *Verz. bekannt. Schmett.* (2) : 29.

(2) If *Apatura* Illiger, 1807, were found to be an older name than *Apatura* Fabricius, 1807, the type of the genus bearing the name "*Apatura*" would cease to be *Papilio iris* Linnaeus, 1758, and would become *Papilio amphinome* Linnaeus, 1767. In other words, the generic name "*Apatura*" would cease to apply to the extremely well-known European and Asiatic genus now universally so named and would be transferred to the very well-known Neotropical genus, the oldest available name for which is *Hamadryas* Hübner, [1806], but which is commonly known as *Ageronia* Hübner, [1819], *Verz. bekannt. Schmett.* (3) : 42.

(3) If *Emesis* Illiger, 1807, were found to be an older name than *Emesis* Fabricius, 1807, the type of the genus bearing the name "*Emesis*" would cease to be *Hesperia ovidius* Fabricius, 1793, and would become *Limnas pharea* Hübner, [1807]. In other words, *Emesis*, which is a very well-known genus in the family RIODINIDAE, would be transferred from the extensive group now universally known by that name to the genus in the same family now known by the name *Mesene* Doubleday, 1847, *List Spec. lep. Ins. Brit. Mus.* **2** : 7.

19. It will be seen from the foregoing examples that, unless and until definite evidence is forthcoming regarding the relative dates of publication of the Illiger and Fabrician names, the strict application of the rules to the eight generic names enumerated in paragraph 9 above can never secure any stability in the nomenclature of the groups concerned. On the contrary, it would be open to any worker to form his own conclusion regarding the relative dates of publication of these names and, having done so, either to accept

these names as having been first published by Fabricius or to accept them as having been first published by Illiger. In either case, the worker concerned would be acting perfectly correctly under the Code. The result could only be confusion rather than uniformity. The present problem is, therefore, one which can only be resolved by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature deciding to use for this purpose the plenary powers conferred upon them in 1913 for settling cases where, in their judgment, the strict application of the rules would clearly lead to greater confusion than uniformity.

20. In 1935 the International Commission were confronted with a very similar case which involved the question whether a particular paper by Fabricius (actually the paper in volume 6 of Illiger's *Magazin*, with which also the present case is concerned) was published before, or after, certain plates in volume 1 of Hübner's *Sammlung exotischer Schmetterlinge*. In the absence of a decision by the Commission, it was in that case a matter of doubt whether the oldest available names for the three genera concerned were the names published by Fabricius or those published by Hübner. This case was considered by the Commission at Lisbon on 16th September 1935 (Lisbon Session, 2nd Meeting, Conclusion 21, published in 1943, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **1** : 20) and the decision then taken has been embodied in *Opinion* 137 (1942, *Opinions and Declarations rendered by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature* **2** : 21–28). That *Opinion* provides that, unless and until evidence to the contrary is forthcoming the names proposed by Fabricius shall have precedence over those proposed for the same genera by Hübner and that, in the event of evidence later being found to show that Hübner's plates (on the legends of which the names in question occur) were published before the paper by Fabricius, the names proposed by Hübner are, under suspension of the rules, to be suppressed in favour of the names proposed by Fabricius. This decision represented a complete and satisfactory solution of the difficulty presented by that case and a parallel decision in the present case would provide an equally satisfactory solution.

21. I accordingly petition the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature to render an *Opinion* stating :—

(i) that unless and until further evidence is forthcoming regarding the precise date on which was published the paper by Fabricius in volume 6 (: 277–289) of Illiger's *Magazin für Insektenkunde*, issued under the date " 1807 ", the generic names published in that paper shall have precedence over the names proposed by Illiger in the review of the portions so far published of volume 1 of Hübner's *Sammlung exotischer Schmetterlinge* published on pages 1177–1181 of Part 303 of the *Allgem. Lit. Ztg*, Halle [Jena], issued on 19th December 1807; and

(ii) that in the event of evidence later being found to show that Illiger's review was published before Fabricius's paper, the names *Apatura*, *Castnia*, *Emesis*, *Helicopis*, *Neptis*, *Nymphidium*, *Pontia*, and *Urania*, as published by Illiger are, under suspension of the rules, to be suppressed in favour of the same names as published by Fabricius.

22. In order that the position may be settled beyond possibility of further argument, I consider that it is desirable that the names *Apatura*, *Castnia*, *Emesis*, *Helicopis*, *Neptis*, *Nymphidium*, and *Urania* as published by Fabricius should be placed on the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology*. If the recommendation in paragraph 21 above is approved, no such action is needed

as regards *Pontia* Fabricius, 1807, since that name was added to the *Official List* as the result of the decision embodied in *Opinion* 137.

23. I accordingly further petition that the International Commission, when acting in the manner recommended in paragraph 21 above, should place on the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology* the undermentioned generic names, with types as shown, each of which has been duly designated in accordance with the provisions of Article 30 of the International Code :—

Name of genus	Type of genus
(1) *Apatura* Fabricius, 1807, *Mag. f. Insektenk.* (Illiger) **6** : 280	*Papilio iris* Linnaeus, 1758, *Syst. Nat.* (ed. 10) **1** : 476 (type designated by Curtis, 1831, *Brit. Entom.* **8** : pl. 338)
(2) *Castnia* Fabricius, 1807, *Mag. f. Insektenk.* (Illiger) **6** : 280	*Papilio icarus* Cramer, [1775], *Uitl. Kapellen* **1** (2) : 26 (type designated by Latreille, 1810, *Consid. gén. Crust. Arach. Ins.* : 440)
(3) *Emesis* Fabricius, 1807, *Mag. f. Insektenk.* (Illiger) **6** : 287	*Hesperia ovidius* Fabricius, 1793, *Ent. syst.* **3** (1) : 320 (type designated by Westwood, [1851], *in* Doubleday, *Gen. diurn. Lep.* (2) : 421, 446)
(4) *Helicopis* Fabricius, 1807, *Mag. f. Insektenk.* (Illiger) **6** : 285	*Papilio cupido* Linnaeus, 1758, *Syst. Nat.* (ed. 10) **1** : 482 (type designated by Scudder, 1875, *Proc. Amer. Acad. Arts Sci.*, Boston **10** : 186)
(5) *Neptis* Fabricius, 1807, *Mag. f. Insektenk.* (Illiger) **6** : 282	*Papilio aceris* Esper, [1783], *Die Schmett.* **1** (Bd. 2) Forts. Tagschmett. : 142 pl. 81 figs. 3, 4 (type designated by Crotch, 1872, *Cistula ent.* **1** : 66)
(6) *Nymphidium* Fabricius, 1807, *Mag. f. Insektenk.* (Illiger) **6** : 286	*Papilio caricae* Linnaeus, 1758, *Syst. Nat.* (ed. 10) **1** : 484 (type designated by Crotch, 1872, *Cistula ent.* **1** : 66)
(7) *Urania* Fabricius, 1807, *Mag. f. Insektenk.* (Illiger) **6** : 279	*Papilio leilus* Linnaeus, 1758, *Syst. Nat.* (ed. 10) **1** : 462 (type designated by Latreille, 1810, *Consid. gén. Crust. Arach. Ins.* : 440)

PROPOSED EMENDATION TO *HYGROBIA* OF *HYGRIOBIA* LATREILLE, 1804 (CLASS INSECTA, ORDER COLEOPTERA)

By H. E. Andrewes

(*Leicester*),

W. A. F. Balfour-Browne

(*formerly Professor of Entomology, Department of Entomology, Imperial College of Science and Technology, London*),

K. G. Blair, D.Sc.

(*formerly Deputy Keeper of the Department of Entomology, British Museum (Natural History)*),

M. Cameron

(*British Museum (Natural History), Zoological Museum, Tring*),

and

C. E. Tottenham

(*University Museum of Zoology, Cambridge*).

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)159.)

In 1804 (*Nouv. Dict. Hist. nat.* **24** : 139) the name *Hygriobia* Latreille was proposed to replace *Hydrachna* Fabricius, 1801, *Syst. Eleuth.* **1** : 255, a name already applied to a genus of water-mites, *Hydrachna* Müller, 1776, *Zool. dan. Prodr.* : xxvi, 188. Latreille repeated this spelling in 1806 (1806, *Gen. Crust. Ins.* **1** : 233) but in 1817 (*Nouv. Dict. Hist. nat.* (ed. 2) **15** : 500) he changed the spelling to *Hygrobia* without explanation.

As this latter spelling has been universally adopted, we are of opinion that in the exercise of the plenary powers conferred upon them by the International Zoological Congress, the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature should as soon as possible take the steps laid down by the Congress for the promulgation of an *Opinion* to the following effect :—

> Acting under their plenary powers, the International Commission hereby emend to *Hygrobia* the name *Hygriobia* Latreille, 1804 (type : *Dytiscus hermanni* (emendation of *herrmanni*) Fabricius, 1775). The name *Hygrobia* Latreille, 1804, with the above type, is hereby added to the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology*.

In this case the strict application of the rules embodied in the International Code of Zoological Nomenclature would cause a serious, and quite unnecessary, disturbance in existing practice and would, in our view, cause greater confusion than uniformity. For this name we are, therefore, in favour of a suspension of the rules.[3]

[3] The above is an extract from the Second Report of the Coleoptera Sub-Committee of the Committee on Generic Nomenclature of the Royal Entomological Society of London. At that time the composition of that Committee was as shown in footnote 8 (p. 247 above). On receiving the Sub-Committee's Report, the Committee on Generic Nomenclature, in their Seventh Report, recommended the Council of the Royal Entomological Society of London to transmit the Coleoptera Sub-Committee's recommendation to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature for favourable consideration. The recommendation was approved by the Council of the Society and, on the publication of the Committee's Seventh Report on 15th February 1940, the Sub-Committee's recommendations were forwarded to the International Commission by the Council of the Society. Since the publication of the Coleoptera Sub-Committee's Second Report (containing Professor Balfour-Browne's proposals in regard to this case), the formula suggested in that Report for the consideration of the International Commission has been slightly redrafted by Professor Balfour-Browne and this revised draft has been substituted for the earlier one in the application as here printed.

ON THE TYPE OF THE GENUS *SCHWAGERINA* VON MÖLLER, 1877 (CLASS RHIZOPODA, ORDER FORAMINIFERA)

By Hubert G. Schenck.

(*Department of Geology, Stanford University, California.*)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)87.)

The present application to the International Commission in regard to the name *Schwagerina* von Möller, 1877, *N. Jahrb. Min.* **1877** : 143 was prepared in consultation with Professor M. L. Thompson, University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kansas, and, though the views expressed in it are mine, they are shared in all essential points by him.

The following is a summary of the *Schwagerina* problem :—

(1) The name *Schwagerina* was proposed by V. von Möller in 1877 and is valid according to the International Rules, that is to say (*a*) it is not a homonym of any earlier generic name and (*b*) it is the earliest available name for either of the species which might be regarded as its type.

(2) Von Möller said that " a typical species " of *Schwagerina* in *Borealis princeps* Ehrenberg, 1842, *K. preuss. Akad. Wiss.*, Berlin **1842** : 274. That species accordingly thus became *Schwagerina princeps* (Ehrenberg). Later writers were unanimous in accepting this species as the genotype of *Schwagerina* von Möller, and it has been established by several subsequent workers beyond question as the genotype of this genus.

(3) The type locality of *Schwagerina princeps* (Ehrenberg) is the late Paleozoic limestone outcropping in Pinega Valley, Archangel, U.S.S.R.

(4) Ehrenberg's original specimens differ morphologically from the specimens which Möller had in hand when he named the genus *Schwagerina*.

(5) The specimens incorrectly identified by Möller as *Schwagerina princeps* (Ehrenberg) have been named *Schwagerina moelleri* by Rauser-Chernoussova, 1937, *Bull. Acad. Sci. U.R.S.S.* **1936** : 578–579.

(6) Dunbar and Skinner hold that only specimens closely similar to *Schwagerina princeps* (Ehrenberg)—not *Schwagerina princeps* (Ehrenberg) as identified by von Möller—can be correctly allocated to the restricted genus *Schwagerina* von Möller.

(7) Therefore, Dunbar and Skinner assert that specimens of *S. moelleri* Rauser-Chernoussova, 1937, and related species must be assigned to another genus which in 1935 they named *Pseudoschwagerina* Dunbar & Skinner, 1935, *J. Palaeont.* **10** : 83, with *Schwagerina uddeni* Beede & Kniker, 1924, *Univ. Texas Bull.* **2432** : 27, pl. 1 figs. 1–2, pl. 4 fig. 10, pl. 6 figs. 1–2, 5–7, as type by original designation. This species was described originally from the Wolfcamp formation, late Paleozoic, of Texas.

(8) The genus *Schwagerina*, as conceived by the original author (von Möller), who misidentified material as " *Borealis princeps* " Ehrenberg, had become thoroughly entrenched in the geological literature prior to 1935. Since 1935, the names *Pseudoschwagerina* Dunbar & Skinner, 1936, and *Schwagerina* von Möller, as interpreted by Dunbar and Skinner have become adopted by most workers to replace the old concept.

(9) Rauser-Chernoussova in 1937 (*Bull. Acad. Sci. U.R.S.S.* **1936** : 577–584) expressed the opinion that the International Commission should sus-

pend the rules in order that the generic name *Schwagerina* might be employed in the sense conceived of by von Möller and as used for fifty-nine years—from 1877 to 1936.[4]

The above is an objective statement of the case—at least as nearly objective as I can make it. I have introduced no opinions, except biological ones. For example, it is an opinion that "*Borealis princeps*" Ehrenberg is generically distinct from the species which von Möller described and illustrated, under the trivial name *princeps*. I thus arrive at this question: Should our concept of the genus *Schwagerina* von Möller be based upon the original specimens of "*Borealis princeps*" Ehrenberg—the genotype of *Schwagerina* von Möller—or upon the material which Valerian von Möller had in hand when he named the genus? What will cause the least confusion, to return to Möller's concept or to accept *Pseudoschwagerina* Dunbar & Skinner?

Since Dunbar and Skinner took the course they did, and since the International Commission did not act promptly in 1937 to save the generic name *Schwagerina* in the sense conceived of by von Möller, I believe that greater stability will be now introduced into zoological nomenclature by adopting the generic name *Pseudoschwagerina* Dunbar & Skinner and the generic name *Schwagerina* von Möller as restricted by Dunbar and Skinner. Professor M. L. Thompson concurs that the Commission should stabilise the nomenclature of this group by rendering such a decision.

[4] The International Commission received a preliminary inquiry in regard to this case from Dr. Carl O. Dunbar in September 1935, but they never received any communication on this subject from Dr. Rauser-Chernoussova. (int'd) F.H.

ON THE STATUS OF THE NAME *ALYDUS* FABRICIUS, 1803 (CLASS INSECTA, ORDER HEMIPTERA)

By W. E. China, M.A.

(*Assistant Keeper in the Department of Entomology, British Museum (Natural History).*)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)160.)

Alydus Fabricius, 1803.

Fabricius 1803, *Syst. Rhyng.* : 251.
Curtis 1831, *Brit. Ent.* : 369.

Type (fixed by Curtis) = *Cimex calcaratus* Linnaeus 1758.

It is necessary to discuss here the status of the genus *Coriscus* Schrank 1796 (*Samml. nat. phys. Aufsäze* **1** : 121), which Kirkaldy and Stichel used in place of *Alydus* Fabricius. This genus was originally based on a single species represented by figures 2 & 3 of Tab. 123 in Schaeffer, [1776–1779], *Icon. Insect. Ratisbon.* Schrank declared, however, that these figures did not represent *Cimex calcaratus* Linnaeus as had been stated by Fabricius and De Geer but an insect which he proceeded to describe (under the new generic name *Coriscus*) as "Möhrensichelwanze." His description of the new genus and species differed from *Cimex calcaratus* Linnaeus in several important structural points, notably in the sickle-shaped curve of the rostrum, in the tri- instead of quadri-segmentation of the rostrum, in the unarmed femora, and in the smaller size. One of Schaeffer's figures certainly does show a strongly curved rostrum quite different from that of *Alydus catcaratus*, but in colour the figure is quite a reasonable representation of the Linnean species. Schrank's colour description of the species also agrees well with *Alydus calcaratus* Linnaeus. In 1801 Schrank (*Fauna Boica* **2** (1) : 99) applied the Latin name *Coriscus dauci* to his "Möhrensichelwanze" which automatically became the genotype of *Coriscus* in spite of the fact that Schrank at the same time included a new species *Coriscus crassipes* and suggested that *Cimex subapterus* De Geer also belonged to this genus. In 1888 Reuter (*Act. Soc. Sci. Fenn.* **15** : 759) fixed the type of *Coriscus* as *C. dauci* Schrank 1801, thereby ending any argument as to the validity of the above automatic citation. Reuter, however, although he admitted important structural differences, sank *Coriscus dauci* Schrank 1801 as a synonym of *Alydus calcaratus* Linnaeus. At the same time he retained the name *Alydus* Fabricius 1803, although *Coriscus*, 1796, and, 1801, had priority. Kirkaldy 1900 (*Entomologist* **33** : 263) also asserted that "*dauci* = *calcaratus*" and that consequently *Alydus* Fabricius, 1803, was homotypical with *Coriscus* Schrank, 1796. In this he was followed by Stichel, 1925 (*Ill. Bestimm. Deuts. Wanzen* **2** : 46). Nevertheless, I do not see how it is possible to synonymise *Coriscus dauci* Schrank with *Cimex calcaratus* Linnaeus in the face of such distinct structural differences and having regard to the author's definite statement to the effect that his "Möhrensichelwanze" was not *Cimex calcaratus* Linnaeus. I consider that it is better to ignore his colour description of *Coriscus dauci*, especially as in 1801 he associated with it a new species *Coriscus crassipes* which has since been synonymised with *Nabis ferus* (Linnaeus, 1758) by Reuter. This brings us to the school of thought which would associate *Coriscus* Schrank with the NABIDAE. Latreille in [1802–1803][5] (*Hist. nat. Crust. Ins.* **3** : 249), by stating "Voyez le genre *Coriscus* de Schr.," suggested that his new genus *Nabis* was identifiable with

[5] For a note on the date of publication of vol. 3 of Bonnini's edition of the *Hist. nat. gén. partic. Crust. Ins.*, see footnote 11 on page 249 above.

Schrank's genus. Stål 1873 (*Enum. Hemipt.* **3** : 112) followed up this suggestion and replaced *Nabis* Latreille, [1802–1803],[6] by *Coriscus* Schrank, 1796, placing *Cimex ferus* and its allies in the typical subgenus *Coriscus*. This in effect made *Cimex ferus* Linnaeus (= *Cimex vagans* Fabricius, 1787 = *Miris vagans* Fabricius, 1794) the genotype, since Stål was the first real reviser of *Coriscus*, and *Miris vagans* Fabr. was the only recognisable original species in the group of species which he associated under the typical subgenus. The fact that Latreille in 1807 (*Gen. Crust. Ins.* **3** : 117) placed *Coriscus* in his omnibus genus *Coreus* (with *Alydus*) need not affect the case.

The generic description of *Coriscus* certainly agrees better with *Nabis* than with the Coreid genus *Alydus*, but unfortunately no known German Nabid agrees with Schrank's colour description of *Coriscus dauci*.

Summarising, there are thus three alternatives :—

1. To synonymise *Coriscus dauci* Schrank, 1801, with *Cimex calcaratus* Linnaeus, 1758, and thereby sink *Alydus* Fabricius, 1803, as a synonym of *Coriscus* Schrank, 1796 (as done by Reuter, Kirkaldy, Stichel);

2. To reject *Coriscus dauci* Schrank, 1801, as genotype of *Coriscus* Schrank, 1796, on the ground of being unidentifiable and to select *Coriscus crassipes* Schrank, 1801 (= *Cimex ferus* Linnaeus, 1758) as the genotype, at the same time sinking Schrank's genus as a synonym of *Nabis* Latreille, [1802–1803],[6] which has been placed on the *Official List of Generic Names* (*Opinion* 104, 1928);

3. To set aside the genus *Coriscus* Schrank, 1796, and, 1801, until the genotype *Coriscus dauci* Schrank, 1801, can be recognised. Unless a type specimen of *Coriscus dauci* Schrank exists, this would be tantamount to invalidating *Coriscus* since as a member of the very well-known German fauna, *dauci* would, if possible, have been identified long ago.[7]

[6] See footnote 5.

[7] The above note is an extract from the paper entitled " The Generic Names of the British Hemiptera–Heteroptera, with a Check List of the British Species " prepared by Mr. W. E. China for the Hemiptera Sub-Committee of the Committee on Generic Nomenclature of the Royal Entomological Society of London. The Committee at that time was composed of :—Mr. Francis Hemming, C.M.G., C.B.E. (*Chairman*), Professor W. A. F. Balfour-Browne, Dr. K. G. Blair, Dr. O. W. Richards, and Mr. N. D. Riley (*Hon. Secretary*); and the Hemiptera Sub-Committee of the above Committee was composed of Mr. E. E. Green and Mr. W. E. China. Mr. China's paper was attached as an Appendix to the First Report of the Hemiptera Sub-Committee, which was submitted to the Committee on Generic Nomenclature in January 1941. In December 1942, it was the subject of the Eighth Report of the Committee on Generic Nomenclature, in which the Committee commended the proposal submitted by Mr. China and the Hemiptera Sub-Committee to the favourable consideration of the Council of the Royal Entomological Society of London for transmission to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature. This proposal was approved by the Council of the Society in February 1943 and, on the publication on 30th June 1943, of the Eighth Report of the Committee on Generic Nomenclature, the recommendation regarding this case was forwarded to the International Commission by the Council of the Society.

PROPOSED SUSPENSION OF THE *RÈGLES* FOR *ALYDUS* FABRICIUS, 1803, AND *CORISCUS* SCHRANK, 1796 (CLASS INSECTA, ORDER HEMIPTERA)

By E. E. Green
(*Camberley*)
and
W. E. China, M.A.
(*Assistant Keeper in the Department of Entomology, British Museum (Natural History).*)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)160.)

We are of the opinion that greater confusion than uniformity would result if *Alydus* Fabricius, 1803 (type *Cimex calcaratus* Linnaeus, 1758, fixed by Curtis 1831, *British Entomology* : 369) were replaced by the earlier name *Coriscus* Schrank, 1796. Apart from the fact that *Alydus* Fabricius had been in continuous use prior to 1925 when Stichel (*Illust. Bestimm. Deutsch. Wanzen* **2** : 46), following Kirkaldy 1900 (*Entomologist* **33** : 263), replaced it by *Coriscus* Schrank, 1796, the genus *Coriscus* is doubtfully identical with *Alydus* Fabricius. *Coriscus* Schrank, 1796 (*Samml. nat. phys. Aufsäze* **1** : 121) is monobasic, since the only species originally included in the genus was the Möhrensichelwanze, later named by Schrank, 1801 (*Fauna Boica* **2** (1) : 99) as *Coriscus dauci*. The genotype of *Coriscus* must therefore be *Coriscus dauci*. Schrank's Möhrensichelwanze was based on figures 2 and 3 of Tab. 123 in Schaeffer, [1776–1779], *Icon. Ins. Ratisbon.* Schrank actually declared that these figures did not represent *Cimex calcaratus* Linnaeus (the genotype of *Alydus*) and his description of the new genus and species differed from *Cimex calcaratus* Linnaeus in several important structural points. In fact, *Coriscus* Schrank was referred by Latreille, 1802, and Stål, 1873, to the family NABIDAE, the latter using it instead of *Nabis* Latreille, [1802–1803].[8] The genus *Nabis* Latreille, however, has been placed by the International Commission on the *Official List of Generic Names*. *Coriscus* Schrank therefore must either replace *Alydus* Fabricius, 1803; or be sunk as a synonym of *Nabis* Latreille, [1802–1803]; or be set aside as based on an unidentifiable species.

We are of the opinion that it is highly desirable that in the exercise of the plenary power conferred on them by the International Zoological Congress, the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature should as soon as possible take the steps laid down by the Congress for the promulgation of an *Opinion* to the following effect :—

> Under suspension of the rules (i) the name *Coriscus* Schrank, 1796, is hereby suppressed and (ii) *Alydus* Fabricius, 1803 (type : *Cimex calcaratus* Linnaeus, 1758, designated by Curtis, 1831) is hereby placed on the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology*.[9]

[8] For a note on the date here assigned to the name *Nabis* Latreille, see footnote 5.

[9] The above is an extract from the First Report of the Hemiptera Sub-Committee of the Committee on Generic Nomenclature of the Royal Entomological Society of London. Since the publication of the Sub-Committee's Report (1943, *Gen. Names Brit. Ins.*, Part 8), there have been discussions between the Secretary to the Commission and the members of the Sub-Committee, as the result of which the latter have agreed to submit to the Commission the simplified formula set out above in place of the wording used in their original proposal. The object of the petition remains unchanged, namely the validation of the generic name *Alydus* Fabricius, 1803, with *Cimex calcaratus* Linnaeus, 1758, as type. (int'd) F.H. 30th October 1944.

ON THE STATUS OF THE NAME *SALDA* FABRICIUS, 1803 (CLASS INSECTA, ORDER HEMIPTERA)

By W. E. China, M.A.

(*Assistant Keeper in the Department of Entomology, British Museum (Natural History).*)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)161.)

Salda Fabricius, 1803.

Fabricius, 1803, *Syst. Rhyng.* : 113.
Blanchard, [1838], *in* Cuvier, *Règne anim.* (Disciples' ed.) Atlas: pl. 90.

Unfortunately the first valid genotype fixation of the genus *Salda* Fabricius, 1803, appears to be that of Blanchard 1838, in the Disciples' edition of Cuvier's *Règne Animal*, Atlas plate 90. On the title-page of this work it is stated, "Édition accompagnée de Planches gravées représentant les types de tous les genres." Since under *Salda* only a single species, *Salda grylloides* Linnaeus (= *Cimex grylloides* Linnaeus, 1761), is figured, this species becomes the genotype of *Salda* Fabricius, 1803, which is thereby transferred to the family LYGAEIDAE and replaces *Geocoris* Fallén, 1814, a non-British genus. The dates of the Disciples' edition of Cuvier were published by Sherborn in 1922 (*Ann. Mag. nat. Hist.* (9) **10** : 555–556) and the date for the Heteroptera is 1838. In 1848 Blanchard (*in* Orbigny, *Dict. univ. Hist. nat.* **11** : 311 and 312) revised his earlier type fixation and cited *Salda littoralis* Fabricius, 1803 = *Cimex littoralis* Linnaeus, 1758. The dates of this work have been verified by Sherborn and Palmer, 1899 (*Ann. Mag. nat. Hist.* (8) **3** : 350) and unfortunately for the familiar name *Salda*, the date of volume **11** is shown to be 1848 : that is, ten years after Blanchard's original type fixation. Unless, therefore, the International Commission agree to invalidate Blanchard's first type citation in the Disciples' edition of Cuvier, the name *Salda* goes to the LYGAEIDAE and replaces the well-known name *Geocoris* Fallén.[10]

PROPOSED SUSPENSION OF THE *RÈGLES* FOR *SALDA* FABRICIUS, 1803 (CLASS INSECTA, ORDER HEMIPTERA)

By E. E. Green

(*Camberley*)

and

W. E. China, M.A.

(*Assistant Keeper in the Department of Entomology, British Museum (Natural History).*)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)161.)

We are of the opinion that it is highly undesirable to accept the first valid type citation for the genus *Salda* Fabricius, 1803, viz. that of Blanchard, 1838 (Cuvier, *Le Règne animal*, Disciples' edition : pl. 90) whereby the type is fixed as *Salda grylloides* Linnaeus = *Cimex grylloides* Linnaeus, 1758. This would mean that the well-known name *Salda* would need to be transferred to another

[10] See footnote 7.

family (LYGAEIDAE) and the family SALDIDAE left without an available family name. In addition the well-known Lygaeid name *Geocoris* Fallén would sink as a synonym of *Salda* Fabricius, 1803.

We are emphatically of the opinion that the foregoing change would lead to greater confusion than uniformity. Accordingly we recommend that in the exercise of the plenary power conferred on them by the International Zoological Congress, the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature should as soon as possible take the steps laid down by the Congress for the promulgation of an *Opinion* to the following effect :—

> Blanchard's original 1838 (*in* Cuvier, *Le Règne animal*, Disciples' edition : pl. 90) citation of *Cimex grylloides* Linnaeus, 1758, as type of *Salda* Fabricius, 1803, *Syst. Rhyng.* : 113 is to be rejected and replaced by Blanchard's 1848 (*in* Orbigny, *Dict. univ. Hist. nat.* **11** : 311 and 312) citation of *Cimex littoralis* Linnaeus, 1758. The name *Salda* Fabricius, 1803 (type *Cimex littoralis* Linnaeus, 1758) is hereby added to the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology* and is not to be transferred from the SALDIDAE to the LYGAEIDAE to replace *Geocoris* Fallén.[11]

PROPOSED SUSPENSION OF THE *RÈGLES* FOR *AQUARIUS* SCHELLENBERG, 1800 (CLASS INSECTA, ORDER HEMIPTERA), A GENUS BASED UPON AN ERRONEOUSLY DETERMINED SPECIES

By W. E. CHINA, M.A.

(*Assistant Keeper in the Department of Entomology, British Museum (Natural History).*)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)144.)

Aquarius Schellenberg, 1800.

Original reference :—Schellenberg, 1800, *Geschl. Land. u. Wass. Wanz. Schweiz.* : 25.

Author by whom the type in question was designated and reference :—Kirkaldy, 1906, *Trans. Amer. ent. Soc.* **32** : 155.

Name of species so designated as type :—*Gerris paludum* Schellenberg, 1800.

Species intended by the original author of the genus when employing the specific name in question :—*Gerris paludum* (Fabricius) Schellenberg, 1800, *nec* Fabricius, 1794, *i.e.*, the species the valid name for which is *Cimex najas* De Geer, 1773, *Mém. Hist. Ins.* **3** : 313.

Discussion of the case :—Schellenberg included (figured) two species in his genus *Aquarius*, *Gerris paludum* Fabricius, 1794, and *Gerris stagnorum* Fabricius, 1794 (*i.e.*, *Cimex stagnorum* Linnaeus, 1758). Kirkaldy, 1906, fixed *Aquarius paludum* Schellenberg, 1800, as the type, indicating at the same time that it was actually *Gerris canalium* Dufour, 1833, *i.e.*, *Cimex najas* De Geer, 1773. Schellenberg's figure indicated an apterous species, whereas *Gerris paludum* is normally macropterous, so that it would appear to represent *Cimex najas* De Geer and not *Gerris paludum* Fabricius. If it were necessary under the Code to assume that Schellenberg's determination of this species was

[11] The above is an extract from the First Report of the Hemiptera Sub-Committee of the Committee on Generic Nomenclature of the Royal Entomological Society of London. For the composition of the Committee and the Sub-Committee referred to, see footnote 7 above.

correct, no change would be necessary in the generic nomenclature since both *Cimex najas* De Geer and *Gerris paludum* Fabricius belong to the same genus. A declaration in this case is desirable, since at any time the discovery of further species might warrant the splitting of *Aquarius* into two genera, in which case it is essential that the type of the original genus should be correctly fixed.

Action by the International Commission desired :—A declaration that the type of *Aquarius* Schellenberg, 1800, is *Cimex najas* De Geer, 1773, *Mém. Hist. Ins.* **3** : 313, and not *Gerris paludum* Fabricius, 1794, *Ent. Syst.* **4** : 188, the included species, since the latter does not agree with Schellenberg's figure and was clearly misidentified by him.[12]

PROPOSED SUSPENSION OF THE *RÈGLES* FOR *BELLOCORIS* HAHN, 1834 (CLASS INSECTA, ORDER HEMIPTERA), A GENUS BASED UPON AN ERRONEOUSLY DETERMINED SPECIES

By W. E. China, M.A.

(*Assistant Keeper in the Department of Entomology, British Museum (Natural History).*)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)144.)

Bellocoris Hahn, 1834

Original reference :—Hahn, 1834, *Wanzen. Ins.* **2** : 42.

Author by whom the type in question was designated and reference :—Westwood, 1840, *Introd. Mod. Class Ins.* **2** (*Syn. Gen. Brit. Ins.*) : 124.

Name of species so designated as type :—*Cimex maurus* Linnaeus, 1758.

Species intended by the original author of the genus when employing the specific name in question :—*Cimex maurus* (Linnaeus) Hahn, 1834, *nec* Linnaeus, 1758, *i.e.*, the species the valid name for which is *Cimex austriacus* Schrank, 1776, *Beitr. z. Naturges. Leipzig* : 78.

Discussion of the case :—Hahn established the genus *Bellocoris* for three species, *Cimex purpureolineatus* Rossi, 1790, *Tetyra maura* Fabricius, 1803 (*Cimex maurus* Linnaeus, 1758) and *Tetyra picta* Fabricius, 1803. The first designation of type in correct form is by Westwood, 1840, who cited *Cimex maurus* Linnaeus. Kirkaldy, however, rightly contends that, as in the case of *Tetyra* Fabricius, 1803, *Cimex maurus* Linnaeus was wrongly identified by Hahn, since Hahn's description disagrees with *C. maurus* Linnaeus in the size—5½ lines—(even females of *C. maurus* L. do not exceed 4½ lines), and in the presence of a distinct longitudinal keel on the scutellum ("in der Mitte desselben ein erhöhter Längskiel"). Hahn's species is in fact *Cimex austriacus*

[12] The present note on *Aquarius* Schellenberg was prepared by Mr. China at the request of the Committee on Generic Nomenclature of the Royal Entomological Society of London, when that Committee had under consideration the Report of their Hemiptera Sub-Committee which later was published (in June 1943) as Part 8 of the *Generic Names of British Insects.* For the composition of the Committee on Generic Nomenclature and of the Hemiptera Sub-Committee of the Royal Entomological Society of London, see footnote 7 above. Mr. China's note on this name was submitted to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature by the Council of the Royal Entomological Society of London.

Schrank, 1776. In effect, therefore, *Cimex maurus* Linnaeus, 1758, was not one of the species originally included in *Bellocoris*, and Westwood's designation was consequently invalid, being based on a misidentification of *Tetyra maura* Fabricius, 1803, with *Cimex maurus* Linnaeus, 1758. If, however, it were necessary under the Code to assume that Hahn's determination was correct, Westwood's designation of *Cimex maurus* Linnaeus as the genotype of *Bellocoris* would be validated. In this case no great nomenclatorial confusion would be caused since *Bellocoris* Hahn, 1834, would merely become a synonym of *Eurygaster* Laporte, 1832, instead of a synonym of *Odontotarsus* Laporte, 1832. Such a course, however, would involve the fixing as genotype of *Bellocoris* Hahn of a species not originally included in that genus, a principle which, if invalidated in the case of *Tetyra* Fabricius,[13] can scarcely be accepted here. It is for this reason that I have disregarded Westwood's selection of *C. maurus* Linnaeus as the type of *Bellocoris*, placed that species in the genus *Eurygaster* Laporte, 1832, with the type of which (*Cimex hottenttotus* Fabricius, 1775) it is congeneric, and have consequently refrained from placing *Bellocoris* Hahn, 1834, as a synonym of *Eurygaster* Laporte, 1832.

Reuter (1888, *Act. Soc. Sci. Fenn.* **15** : 758) again designated *Cimex maurus* Linnaeus, 1758, as the type of *Bellocoris* (Hahn) Westwood. This too has been rejected on the same above-mentioned grounds and the first valid fixation by Kirkaldy of *Cimex purpureolineatus* Rossi, 1790, accepted. Thereby *Bellocoris* Hahn, 1834, becomes a synonym of *Odontotarsus* Laporte, 1832.

Action by the International Commission desired :—A declaration that the action of Westwood (1840) in designating *Cimex maurus* Linnaeus, 1758, as the type of *Bellocoris* Hahn, 1834, is invalid, since that species was not included in the genus by Hahn, the species cited under that name being *Cimex austriacus* Schrank, 1776, *Beitr. z. Naturges. Leipzig* : 78 (= *C. nigrocucullatus* Goeze, 1778, *Ent. Beytr.* **2** : 235) and that the type of the genus *Bellocoris* Hahn is the next species to be designated as such by an author complying with the provisions of Article 30 of the International Code; and that, in consequence, the type of that genus is *Cimex purpureolineatus* Rossi, 1790 (*Faun. Etr.* **2** : 228) which is one of the species originally included in the genus by Hahn, and was designated as the type by Kirkaldy in 1909, *Cat. Hemipt.* **1** : 270.[14]

PROPOSED SUSPENSION OF THE *RÈGLES* FOR *BEOSUS* AMYOT & SERVILLE, 1843 (CLASS INSECTA, ORDER HEMIPTERA), A GENUS BASED UPON AN ERRONEOUSLY DETERMINED SPECIES

By W. E. China, M.A.

(*Assistant Keeper in the Department of Entomology, British Museum (Natural History).*)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)144.)

Beosus Amyot & Serville, 1843

Original reference :—Amyot and Serville, 1843 (Roret's Suite à Buffon), *Hist. nat. Ins. Hémipt.* : 254.

Author by whom type in question was designated and reference :—The genus is monobasic.

[13] For a discussion of the case of *Tetyra* Fabricius, 1803, see pp. 278, 287.

[14] See footnote 12.

Monobasic type is *Lygaeus quadratus* Fabricius, 1803.

Species intended by the original author of the genus when employing the specific name in question :—*Lygaeus quadratus* (Fabricius) Amyot & Serville, 1843, *nec* Fabricius, 1803, *i.e.*, the species the valid name for which is *Cimex maritimus* Scopoli, 1763, *Ent. Carn.* : 129.

Discussion of the case :—Amyot and Serville based their genus *Beosus* on a single species which they assumed to be *Lygaeus quadratus* Fabricius, 1803. Fabricius's species, however, was wrongly identified by them. They gave the length of the species as 7 mm., whereas *Lygaeus quadratus* Fabricius does not exceed 5 mm. They also stated " legs pale, the extremity of the femora black," whereas in *Lygaeus quadratus* Fabricius the femora are black with the extreme apices pale. In their generic synopsis of *Beosus* they stated " anterior lateral angles of pronotum not extending beyond the line of the eyes (anterior margin of pronotum) on each side," a character possessed by *Cimex maritimus* Scopoli and not by *Lygaeus quadratus* Fabricius, 1803. It has been generally agreed by Hemipterists that the species Amyot and Serville had before them was *Cimex maritimus* Scopoli, 1763 (= *Lygaeus luscus* Fabricius, 1794), which should therefore be the type of *Beosus* Amyot & Serville, 1843. If it were necessary under the Code to assume that Amyot and Serville's determination of *Lygaeus quadratus* Fabricius was correct, *Beosus* auct. would be without a name and *Xanthochilus* Stål, 1872, would become a synonym of *Beosus* Amyot & Serville, 1843. Such action would run directly counter to Amyot and Serville's intentions and would be open to the strongest objection in that it would involve the acceptance as type of this genus of a species agreeing neither with the original generic description nor with Amyot and Serville's description of the sole species of the genus. It is for this reason that I have accepted *Cimex maritimus* Scopoli, 1763, as the type of *Beosus* Amyot & Serville, 1843.

Action by the International Commission desired :—A declaration that the type of *Beosus* Amyot & Serville, 1843, is *Cimex maritimus* Scopoli, 1763, *Ent. Carn.* : 129, and not *Lygaeus quadratus* Fabricius, 1803, *Syst. Rhyng.* : 232, the single species described in the genus by Amyot and Serville, since the latter species does not agree with the generic description nor with the description of the type species given by Amyot and Serville, which was clearly misidentified as *Lygaeus quadratus* Fabricius.[15]

[15] See footnote 12 above.

PROPOSED SUSPENSION OF THE *RÈGLES* FOR *CATOPLATUS* SPINOLA, 1837 (CLASS INSECTA, ORDER HEMIPTERA), A GENUS BASED UPON AN ERRONEOUSLY DETERMINED SPECIES

By W. E. China, M.A.

(*Assistant Keeper in the Department of Entomology, British Museum (Natural History).*)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)144.)

Catoplatus Spinola, 1837

Original reference :—Spinola, 1837, *Essai Ins. Hémipt.* : 167.

Author by whom the type in question was designated and reference :—The genus is monobasic.

Name of species so designated as type :—The monobasic type is *Acanthia costata* Fabricius, 1794.

Species intended by the original author of the genus when employing the specific name in question :—*Acanthia costata* (Fabricius) Spinola, 1837, *nec* Fabricius, 1794, *i.e.*, the species the valid name for which is *Tingis fabricii* Stål, 1868, *Hemipt. Fabric.* 1 (*K. Svensk. Vet.-Ak. Handl.* **4** (11)) : 93.

Discussion of the case :—Spinola based his genus on a single species *Acanthia costata* Fabricius, 1794. Unfortunately he misidentified this species. Stål, 1868, *Hemipt. Fabric.* **1** : 93, who examined the Fabrician type, showed that Spinola's species was distinct from that of Fabricius and consequently renamed it *Tingis fabricii*. The type of *Catoplatus* Spinola therefore is not the wrongly identified *Acanthia costata* Fabricius, 1794, but *Tingis fabricii* Stål, 1868. The identity of the true *Acanthia costata* Fabricius is in doubt. Fabricius recorded it from northern Europe. Stål, 1873, *Enum. Hemipt.* **3** : 129, refers it to Laporte's genus *Eurycera*, but states " Patria ignota." Horváth 1906, *Ann. Mus. nat. Hung.* **4** : 94, is of the opinion that this is an exotic African species of the genus *Copium* Thunberg 1822, of which genus *Eurycera* Laporte, 1832, is a synonym. If therefore it were necessary under the Code to assume that Spinola's determination of *Acanthia costata* Fabricius, 1794, was correct, *Catoplatus* Spinola, 1837, would become a synonym of *Copium* Thunberg, 1822, and the well-known European genus *Catoplatus* auct. *nec* Spinola would be left without a name. Such action would not only cause confusion in the nomenclature of the genus *Catoplatus* but would run directly counter to Spinola's intentions and would involve the designation as type of *Catoplatus* of a species disagreeing with the generic description. It is for this reason that I have accepted *Tingis fabricii* Stål, 1868, as the type of *Catoplatus* Spinola, 1837.

Action by the International Commission desired :—A declaration that the type of *Catoplatus* Spinola, 1837, is *Tingis fabricii* Stål, 1868, *Hemipt. Fabric.* **1** (*K. Svensk. Vet.-Ak. Handl.* **4** (11)) : 93, and not *Acanthia costata* Fabricius, 1794, *Ent. syst.* **4** : 77, the single species included in the genus by Spinola, since the Fabrician species agrees neither with Spinola's generic description nor with the description of the type species given by Spinola, which was clearly misidentified as *Acanthia costata* Fabricius.[16]

[16] See footnote 12 above.

PROPOSED SUSPENSION OF THE *RÈGLES* FOR *DICTYONOTA* CURTIS, 1827 (CLASS INSECTA, ORDER HEMIPTERA), A GENUS BASED UPON AN ERRONEOUSLY DETERMINED SPECIES

By W. E. China, M.A.

(*Assistant Keeeper in the Department of Entomology, British Museum (Natural History).*)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)144.)

Dictyonota Curtis, 1827

Original reference :—Curtis, 1827, *Brit. Ent.* : 154.

Author by whom the type in question was designated and reference :—Curtis, 1827, *Brit. Ent.* : 154.

Name of species so designated as type :—*Tingis eryngii* Latreille, 1804.

Species intended by the original author of the genus when employing the specific name in question :—*Tingis eryngii* (Latreille) Curtis, 1827, *nec* Latreille 1804, *i.e.*, the species the valid name for which is *Dictyonota strichnocera* Fieber, 1844, *Ent. Monogr.* : 95.

Discussion of the case :—Curtis founded his genus *Dictyonota* for two British species, *Tingis crassicornis* Fallén, 1818, *Mon. Cim. Suec.* : 38 and *Tingis eryngii* Latreille, [1804], *Hist. Nat. Crust. Ins.* **12** : 253. Of these he designated *Tingis eryngii* Latreille as the type of the genus. Unfortunately Curtis, as is clear from his description and excellent figure, misidentified Latreille's species (which does not occur in Britain) and the British species he actually described under Latreille's name has since been redescribed and named *Dictyonota strichnocera* by Fieber, 1844. The true *Tingis eryngii* Latreille, [1804], is actually a synonym of *Cimex carthusianus* Goeze, 1778, *Ent. Beytr.* **2** : 268,[17] and belongs to the genus *Catoplatus* Spinola, 1837, *Essai Ins. Hemipt.* : 167. This synonymy has been generally accepted by Hemipterists for many years. *Dictyonota strichnocera* Fieber must therefore be accepted as the type of *Dictyonota*. If it were necessary under the Code to assume that Curtis's determination of *Tingis eryngii* Latreille was correct, the well-known genus *Catoplatus* Spinola, 1837, would become a synonym of *Dictyonota* Curtis, 1827, and the equally well-known genus *Dictyonota* auct. would take the name *Scraulia* Stål, 1874. Such action would run directly counter to Curtis's intentions and would be open to the strongest objection in that it would involve the acceptance as type of this genus of a species agreeing neither with the original generic description nor with Curtis's own description and figure of the type species. It is for this reason that I have accepted *Dictyonota strichnocera* Fieber, 1844, as the type of *Dictyonota* Curtis, 1827.

Action by the International Commission desired :—A declaration that the type of *Dictyonota* Curtis, 1827, is *Dictyonota strichnocera* Fieber, 1844, *Ent. Monogr.* : 95 and not *Tingis eryngii* Latreille, [1804], *Hist. Nat. Crust. Ins.* **12** : 253, since the latter species agrees neither with the generic description nor with the description and figure of the type species given by Curtis, which was clearly misidentified as *Tingis eryngii* Latreille.[18]

[17] The question whether names published in Goeze's *Ent. Beytrage* satisfy the requirements of proviso (b) to Article 25 of the *Règles Internationales* and therefore whether such names have any rights under the Law of Priority is a matter of doubt. The International Commission understand that this question is likely to be submitted to them at an early date for decision.

[18] See footnote 12 above.

PROPOSED SUSPENSION OF THE *RÈGLES* FOR *GASTRODES* WESTWOOD, 1840 (CLASS INSECTA, ORDER HEMIPTERA), A GENUS BASED UPON AN ERRONEOUSLY DETERMINED SPECIES

By W. E. China, M.A.

(*Assistant Keeper in the Department of Entomology, British Museum (Natural History).*)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)144.)

Gastrodes Westwood, 1840

Original reference :—Westwood, 1840, *Introd. mod. Class. Ins.* **2** (*Syn. Gen. Brit. Ins.*) : 122.

Author by whom the type in question was designated and reference :—The genus is monobasic.

Name of species so designated as type :—Monobasic type is *Cimex abietis* Linnaeus, 1758.

Species intended by the original author of the genus when employing the specific name in question :—*Cimex abietis* (Linnaeus) Westwood, 1840, *nec* Linnaeus, 1758, *i.e.*, the species the valid name for which is *Cimex abietum* Bergroth, 1914, *Wien. ent. Ztg.* **33** : 183.

Discussion of the case :—Westwood based his genus on a single species which he (in common with all authors up to 1898) assumed to be *Cimex abietis* Linnaeus, 1758. Horváth, however, in 1898, *Rev. Ent.*, Caen, **17** : 277, showed conclusively that the true *Cimex abietis* Linnaeus is identical with *Lygaeus erraticus* Fabricius, 1794, a species at that time referred to the genus *Eremocoris* Fieber, 1860, and since fixed as the type of that genus by Distant, 1903, *Faun. Brit. Ind. Rhyn.* **2** : 92. In consequence the species *Cimex abietis* Westwood et auct. remained without a name and was re-named *Cimex abietum* by Bergroth, 1914, *Wien. ent. Ztg.* **33** : 183. The type of *Gastrodes* Westwood therefore is not the wrongly identified *Cimex abietis* Linnaeus, 1758, but *Cimex abietum* Bergroth, 1914.

If it were necessary under the Code to assume that Westwood's determination of this species was correct, Westwood's designation of *Cimex abietis* Linnaeus as the type of *Gastrodes* Westwood would involve the transfer of that name to the genus at present known as *Eremocoris* Fieber, 1860, while the genus at present known as *Gastrodes* would become *Oimoctes* Gistel, 1848. Such action would not only cause confusion in the nomenclature of these genera but would run directly counter to Westwood's intentions and would be open to the strongest objection in that it would involve the designation as type of *Gastrodes* of a species disagreeing completely with the generic description. It is for this reason that I have disregarded Westwood's citation of *Cimex abietis* Linnaeus as the type of the genus, accepted *Cimex abietum* Bergroth, and treated *Cimex abietis* Linnaeus as an *Eremocoris*.

Action by the International Commission desired :—A declaration that the action of Westwood in citing *Cimex abietis* Linnaeus, 1758, as the type of *Gastrodes* Westwood, 1840, is invalid, since that species was not included in the genus, the species which he there designated under that name being in fact another species generically distinct from *Cimex abietis* Linnaeus and since named *Cimex abietum* Bergroth, 1914. In consequence the type of the genus *Gastrodes* Westwood, 1840, is *Cimex abietum* Bergroth, 1914, the sole species originally included by Westwood in the genus.[19]

[19] See footnote 12 above.

PROPOSED SUSPENSION OF THE *RÈGLES* FOR *ONCOTYLUS* FIEBER, 1858 (CLASS INSECTA, ORDER HEMIPTERA), A GENUS BASED UPON AN ERRONEOUSLY DETERMINED SPECIES

By W. E. China, M.A.

(*Assistant Keeper in the Department of Entomology, British Museum (Natural History).*)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)144.)

Oncotylus Fieber, 1858

Original reference :—Fieber, 1858, *Wien. ent. Monatschr.* **2** : 318.

Author by whom the type in question was designated and reference :—Kirkaldy, 1906, *Trans. Amer. ent. Soc.* **32** : 126.

Name of species so designated as type :—*Capsus tanaceti* Fieber, 1858, *i.e.*, *Capsus tanaceti* (Fallén) Fieber, 1858, *nec* Fallén, 1807.

Species intended by the original author of the genus when employing the specific name in question :—*Capsus tanaceti* Herrich-Schaeffer, 1836, *nec Capsus tanaceti* Fallén, 1807, *i.e.*, the species the valid name of which is *Oncotylus punctipes* Reuter, 1873, *Bihang K. Svensk. Vet.-Ak. Handl.* **3** (1) : 42.

Discussion of case :—Fieber based his genus *Oncotylus* on *Capsus decolor* Fallén, 1807, *Capsus tanaceti* Fallén, 1807, and *Oncotylus fenestratus* Fieber, 1858. Kirkaldy, 1906, fixed *Oncotylus tanaceti* Fieber, 1858, as the type, indicating that this species was not *Capsus tanaceti* Fallén, 1807, the species actually referred to by Fieber, but *Oncotylus punctipes* Reuter, 1879, as had been shown by Reuter, 1873, *Bihang K. Svensk. Vet.-Akad. Handl.* **3** (1) : 42 and 1879, *Act. Soc. Sci. Fenn.* **13** (2) : 279. Fieber apparently followed Herrich-Schaeffer 1836, *Wanz. Ins.* **3** : 85 and Kirschbaum, 1855, *Rhyn. Wiesbaden* **1** : (*Jahrb. Ver. Naturk. Herz. Nassau* **10** :) 80 no. 102, in his identification of *Capsus tanaceti* Fallén, 1807, but, as shown by Reuter, the species which they wrongly identified as such was a distinct species later described by Reuter as *Oncotylus punctipes*, which therefore becomes the type of *Oncotylus* Fieber. If it were necessary under the Code to assume that Fieber's determination of *Capsus tanaceti* Fallén was correct, then *Oncotylus* Fieber, 1858, would replace *Megalocoleus* Reuter, 1890, which is a new name for *Macrocoleus* Fieber, 1858, *nec* Desvignes, 1849 (Hymenoptera) and *Oncotylus* auct. would become *Anoterops* Fieber, 1858. Such action would not only cause confusion in the nomenclature of these genera, but would also run directly counter to Fieber's intention, which was to separate his genera *Oncotylus* and *Macrocoleus* (*i.e.*, *Megalocoleus* Reuter n.n.) described within a few pages of one another in the same work. It would also be open to the strongest objection in that it would involve the designation as type of *Oncotylus* of a species disagreeing with the generic description. It is for this reason that I have accepted *Oncotylus punctipes* Reuter instead of *Capsus tanaceti* Fallén as type of *Oncotylus*.

Action by the International Commission desired :—A declaration that the type of *Oncotylus* Fieber, 1858, is *Oncotylus punctipes* Reuter, 1873, *Bihang K. Svensk. Vet.-Akad. Handl.* **3** (1) : 42 and not *Capsus* (*Phytocoris*) *tanaceti* Fallén, 1807, *Hem. Suec. Cimic.* : 83, the species included in the genus by Fieber, since Fallén's species agrees neither with Fieber's generic description nor with the description of the type species given by Fieber, which was clearly misidentified as *Capsus* (*Phytocoris*) *tanaceti* Fallén.[20]

[20] See footnote 12 above.

PROPOSED SUSPENSION OF THE *RÈGLES* FOR *PACHYLOPS* FIEBER, 1858 (CLASS INSECTA, ORDER HEMIPTERA), A GENUS BASED UPON AN ERRONEOUSLY DETERMINED SPECIES

By W. E. China, M.A.

(*Assistant Keeper in the Department of Entomology, British Museum (Natural History).*)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)144.)

Pachylops Fieber, 1858

Original reference :—Fieber, 1858, *Wien. ent. Monatschr.* **2** : 314.

Author by whom the type in question was designated and reference :—The genus is monobasic.

Name of species so designated as type :—The monobasic type is *Capsus chloropterus* Kirschbaum, 1855.

Species intended by the original author of the genus when employing the specific name in question :—*Capsus chloropterus* (Kirschbaum) Fieber, 1858, *nec* Kirschbaum, 1855, *i.e.*, the species the valid name for which is *Litosoma bicolor* Douglas & Scott, 1868, *Ent. mon. Mag.* **4** : 267.

Discussion of the case :—Fieber based his genus on a single species which he assumed to be *Capsus chloropterus* Kirschbaum, 1855, *Rhyn. Wiesbaden* **1** : (*Jahrb. Ver. Naturk. Herz. Nassau* **10** : 249). Reuter, 1877 (*Ent. mon. Mag.* **14** : 129), showed that Fieber misidentified Kirschbaum's species (possibly because he received a wrongly identified specimen from Kirschbaum himself), and that the species Fieber (followed by Douglas and Scott, and Saunders) determined as *Capsus chloropterus* Kirschbaum is a distinct species which was later described by Douglas and Scott under the name *Litosoma bicolor*. The type of *Pachylops* is therefore *Litosoma bicolor* Douglas & Scott, 1868, and not the wrongly identified *Capsus chloropterus* Kirschbaum, 1855. If it were necessary under the Code to assume that Fieber's determination of this species was correct, then *Pachylops* Fieber would replace the well-known *Orthotylus* Fieber, 1858, and *Pachylops* auct. *nec* Fieber would become *Hypsitylus* Fieber, 1861. Such action would not only cause confusion in the nomenclature of these genera but would run directly counter to Fieber's intention, which was to separate distinctly his two new genera *Pachylops* and *Orthotylus* described on consecutive pages of the same work. It would also be open to the strongest objection in that it would involve the designation as type of *Pachylops* of a species disagreeing completely with the generic description. It is for these reasons that I have accepted *Litosoma bicolor* Douglas & Scott, 1868, instead of *Capsus chloropterus* Kirschbaum, 1855, as the type of *Pachylops*. Since *Capsus chloropterus* Kirschbaum, 1855, is a primary homonym of *Capsus chloropterus* Herrich-Schaeffer, 1853, the next available name, which is *Litosoma virescens* Douglas & Scott, 1865, must be used if *Capsus chloropterus* is accepted as type.

Action by the International Commission desired :—A declaration that the type of *Pachylops* Fieber, 1858, is *Litosoma bicolor* Douglas & Scott, 1868, *Ent. mon. Mag.* **4** : 267 and not *Capsus chloropterus* Kirschbaum, 1855, *Rhyn. Wiesbaden* **1** : (*Jahrb. Ver. Naturk. Herz. Nassau* **10** : 249), the single species included in the genus by Fieber, since the Kirschbaum species agrees neither with Fieber's generic description nor with the description of the type species given by Fieber, which was clearly misidentified as *Capsus chloropterus* Kirschbaum.[21]

[21] See footnote 12 above.

PROPOSED SUSPENSION OF THE *RÈGLES* FOR *PILOPHORUS* HAHN, 1826 (CLASS INSECTA, ORDER HEMIPTERA), A GENUS BASED UPON AN ERRONEOUSLY DETERMINED SPECIES

By W. E. China, M.A.

(*Assistant Keeper in the Department of Entomology, British Museum (Natural History).*)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)144.)

Pilophorus Hahn, 1826

Original reference :—Hahn, 1826, *Icon. Cimic.* **1** : 22.

Author by whom the type in question was designated and reference :—The genus is monobasic.

Name of species so designated as type :—The monobasic type is *Cimex bifasciatus* Fabricius, 1775.

Species intended by the original author of the genus when employing the specific name in question :—*Cimex bifasciatus* (Fabricius) Hahn, 1826, *nec* Fabricius, 1775, *i.e.*, the species the valid name for which is *Cimex clavatus* Linnaeus, 1767.

Discussion of the case :—Hahn based his genus on a single species which he assumed to be *Cimex bifasciatus* Fabricius. Fabricius's species, however, was wrongly identified by him. His figure clearly shows that he had before him *Cimex clavatus* Linnaeus, 1767, *Syst. Nat.* (ed. 12) **1** (2) : 729. It has been generally agreed by hemipterists that the type of *Pilophorus* is therefore *Cimex clavatus* Linnaeus and not *Cimex bifasciatus* Fabricius. However, even if it were necessary under the Code to assume that Hahn's determination of *Cimex bifasciatus* Fabricius was correct, no change in the nomenclature of the genus would be necessary since *Cimex bifasciatus* Fabricius, 1775, also belongs to the genus *Pilophorus*, although since it is a primary homonym of *Cimex bifasciatus* Müller, 1764, *Faun. Ins. Fridrichsdal.* : 29, it must take the next available name, which is *Capsus cinnamopterus* Kirschbaum, 1855, *Rhyn. Wiesbaden* (*Jahrb. Ver. Naturk. Herz. Nassau* **10** : 232). At first sight it seems unnecessary for the Commission to make a declaration in this case, but for the sake of the principle involved, it is probably better to ask for such a declaration. In any case it is not impossible that at some future date the genus *Pilophorus* might be split up into two or more genera, in which case it is essential that the type of the original genus should be correctly fixed.

Action by the International Commission desired :—A declaration that the type of *Pilophorus* Hahn, 1826, is *Cimex clavatus* Linnaeus, 1767, *Syst. Nat.* (ed. 12) **1** (2) : 729, and not *Cimex bifasciatus* Fabricius, 1775, *Syst. Ent.* : 725, the sole species included in the genus by Hahn, since the latter species does not agree with Hahn's figure and was clearly misidentified by Hahn, whereas the figure agrees well with *Cimex clavatus* Linnaeus, 1767.[22]

[22] See footnote 12 above.

PROPOSED SUSPENSION OF THE *RÈGLES* FOR *TETYRA* FABRICIUS, 1803 (CLASS INSECTA, ORDER HEMIPTERA), A GENUS BASED UPON AN ERRONEOUSLY DETERMINED SPECIES

By W. E. China, M.A.

(*Assistant Keeper in the Department of Entomology, British Museum (Natural History).*)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)144.)

Tetyra Fabricius, 1803

Original reference :—Fabricius, 1803, *Syst. Rhyng.* : 128.

Author by whom the type in question was designated and reference :—Curtis, 1838, *Brit. Ent.* : 685.

Name of species so designated as type :—*Cimex maurus* Linnaeus, 1758.

Species intended by the original author of the genus when employing the specific name in question :—*Cimex maurus* (Linnaeus) Fabricius, 1803, *nec* Linnaeus, 1758, *i.e.*, the species the valid name for which is *Cimex austriacus* Schrank, 1776, *Beitr. z. Naturges. Leipzig* : 78.

Discussion of the case :—Fabricius established his genus *Tetyra* to hold 79 species. Reuter, Kirkaldy, Van Duzee and other well-known hemipterists maintained that Fabricius himself fixed the type of his genera by repetition of the generic characters immediately after the description of the type species. In the case of *Tetyra* these workers for this reason accepted the American *Cimex arcuatus* Fabricius, 1794 (*Ent. Syst.* **4** : 83, 12) as the genotype of *Tetyra*, thereby making *Tetyra* an American genus. This method of type fixation, however, has been rejected by the International Commission under Article 30 (g), in *Opinion* 81, since the 1803 Fabrician type fixation for *Cimex* Linnaeus, viz., *C. bidens*, is not accepted in section F of the above *Opinion*.[23] The first citation in valid form is that by Curtis, 1838, who designated *Cimex maurus* Linnaeus, a well-known British and European species.

Reuter (1888, *Act. Soc. Sci. Fenn.* **15** : 451) has demonstrated that the *Cimex maurus* included in *Tetyra* by Fabricius, 1803, is not the *Cimex maurus* of Linnaeus, 1758, and was wrongly identified as such by Fabricius, since Linnaeus wrote "*Habitat in Mauritania, in Svecia paullo minor*" whereas Fabricius stated "*Habitat in Oriente, apud nos quadruplo minor.*" In effect *Cimex maurus* Linnaeus, 1758, was not one of the species originally included in *Tetyra* and Curtis's designation is consequently invalid.

If, however, it were necessary under the Code to assume that Fabricius's determination of this species was correct, Curtis's designation of *Cimex maurus* Linnaeus as the genotype of *Tetyra* would be validated and would involve the use of a new name for the American genus and the extension of *Tetyra* to the European list in place of the well-used name *Eurygaster* Laporte, 1832, a name of some importance in economic entomology as including pests of wheat. Such action would also run directly counter to Fabricius's intentions in view of his afore-mentioned method of type indication, and would be open to the strongest objection in that it would involve the designation as the type of this genus of a species not included in it by Fabricius, the original author of the name.

Action by the International Commission desired :—A declaration that the action of Curtis (1838) in designating *Cimex maurus* Linnaeus, 1758, as the

[23] See 1924, *Smithson. misc. Coll.* **73** (2) : 28.

type of *Tetyra* Fabricius, 1803, is invalid, since that species was not included by Fabricius in the genus, the species which he there cited under that name being *Cimex austriacus* Schrank, 1776, *Beitr. z. Naturges. Leipzig* : 78, and that the type of the genus *Tetyra* Fabricius is the next species to be designated as such by an author complying with the provisions of Article 30 of the International Code; and that in consequence the type of that genus is *Cimex arcuata* Fabricius, 1794, *Ent. Syst.* **4** : 83 *nec Cimex arcuatus* Gmelin, 1789 (= *Cimex antillarum* Kirkaldy, 1909 nom. n.) which is one of the species originally included in the genus by Fabricius and was designated as the type by Kirkaldy, 1900, in *Entomologist* **33** : 263.[24]

[24] See footnote 12 above.

(*continued from front wrapper*)

On the question whether eight generic names in the Order Lepidoptera (Class Insecta) commonly accepted as having been first published by Fabricius in 1807 were published by Illiger earlier in the same year. By Francis Hemming, C.M.G., C.B.E., *Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature* . . . . . p. 261

Proposed emendation to *Hygrobia* of *Hygriobia* Latreille, 1804 (Class Insecta, Order Coleoptera). By H. E. Andrewes, *Leicester;* W. A. F. Balfour-Browne, *formerly Professor of Entomology, Department of Entomology, Imperial College of Science and Technology, London;* K. G. Blair, D.Sc., *formerly Deputy Keeper of the Department of Entomology, British Museum* (*Natural History*); M. Cameron, *British Museum* (*Natural History*), *Zoological Museum, Tring;* and C. E. Tottenham, *University Museum of Zoology, Cambridge* . . . . . p. 270

On the type of the genus *Schwagerina* Von Möller, 1877 (Class Rhizopoda, Order Foraminifera). By Hubert G. Schenck, *Department of Geology, Stanford University, California* . . . . . p. 271

On the status of the name *Alydus* Fabricius, 1803 (Class Insecta, Order Hemiptera). By W. E. China, M.A., *Assistant Keeper in the Department of Entomology, British Museum* (*Natural History*) . . . . . p. 273

Proposed suspension of the *Règles* for *Alydus* Fabricius, 1803 (Class Insecta, Order Hemiptera). By E. E. Green, *Camberley*, and W. E. China, M.A., *Assistant Keeper in the Department of Entomology, British Museum* (*Natural History*) . . . . . p. 275

On the status of the name *Salda* Fabricius, 1803 (Class Insecta, Order Hemiptera). By W. E. China, M.A., *Assistant Keeper in the Department of Entomology, British Museum* (*Natural History*) . . . . . p. 276

Proposed suspension of the *Règles* for *Salda* Fabricius, 1803 (Class Insecta, Order Hemiptera). By E. E. Green, *Camberley*, and W. E. China, M.A., *Assistant Keeper in the Department of Entomology, British Museum* (*Natural History*) . . . . . p. 276

Proposed suspension of the *Règles* for *Aquarius* Schellenberg, 1800 (Class Insecta, Order Hemiptera), a genus based upon an erroneously determined species. By W. E. China, M.A., *Assistant Keeper in the Department of Entomology, British Museum* (*Natural History*) . . . . . p. 277

Proposed suspension of the *Règles* for *Bellocoris* Hahn, 1834 (Class Insecta, Order Hemiptera), a genus based upon an erroneously determined species. By W. E. China, M.A., *Assistant Keeper in the Department of Entomology, British Museum* (*Natural History*) . . . . . p. 278

Proposed suspension of the *Règles* for *Beosus* Amyot and Serville, 1843 (Class Insecta, Order Hemiptera), a genus based upon an erroneously determined species. By W. E. China, M.A., *Assistant Keeper in the Department of Entomology, British Museum* (*Natural History*) . . . . . p. 279

Proposed suspension of the *Règles* for *Catoplatus* Spinola, 1837 (Class Insecta, Order Hemiptera), a genus based upon an erroneously determined species. By W. E. China, M.A., *Assistant Keeper in the Department of Entomology, British Museum* (*Natural History*) . . . . . p. 281

Proposed suspension of the *Règles* for *Dictyonota* Curtis, 1827 (Class Insecta, Order Hemiptera), a genus based upon an erroneously determined species. By W. E. China, M.A., *Assistant Keeper in the Department of Entomology, British Museum* (*Natural History*) . . . . . p. 282

Proposed suspension of the *Règles* for *Gastrodes* Westwood, 1840 (Class Insecta, Order Hemiptera), a genus based upon an erroneously determined species. By W. E. China, M.A., *Assistant Keeper in the Department of Entomology, British Museum* (*Natural History*) . . . . . p. 283

Proposed suspension of the *Règles* for *Oncotylus* Fieber, 1858 (Class Insecta, Order Hemiptera), a genus based upon an erroneously determined species. By W. E. China, M.A., *Assistant Keeper in the Department of Entomology, British Museum* (*Natural History*) . . . . . p. 284

Proposed suspension of the *Règles* for *Pachylops* Fieber, 1858 (Class Insecta, Order Hemiptera), a genus based upon an erroneously determined species. By W. E. China, M.A., *Assistant Keeper in the Department of Entomology, British Museum* (*Natural History*) . . . . . p. 285

Proposed suspension of the *Règles* for *Pilophorus* Hahn, 1826 (Class Insecta, Order Hemiptera), a genus based upon an erroneously determined species. By W. E. China, M.A., *Assistant Keeper in the Department of Entomology, British Museum* (*Natural History*) . . . . . p. 286

Proposed suspension of the *Règles* for *Tetyra* Fabricius, 1803 (Class Insecta, Order Hemiptera), a genus based upon an erroneously determined species. By W. E. China, M.A., *Assistant Keeper in the Department of Entomology, British Museum* (*Natural History*) . . . . . p. 287

OPINIONS AND DECLARATIONS RENDERED BY THE INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION ON ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

The above work is being published in three volumes concurrently, namely:—

VOLUME 1. This volume, which will be published in Sections with continuous pagination, will contain *Declarations* 1–9 (which have never previously been published) and *Opinions* 1–133 (the original issue of which is now out of print). Parts 1–25 (containing *Declarations* 1–9 and *Opinions* 1–16) have now been published. Part 26 containing the index and title page of Section A will be published as soon as possible. The publication of Parts of Section B will be started immediately thereafter.

VOLUME 2. This volume, which contains the record of the decisions taken by the International Commission at Lisbon in 1935, is being published in two Sections (Sections A and B) with continuous pagination. Of these, Section A, containing *Declarations* 10–12 and *Opinions* 134–160, is now complete. Of Section B, which will contain *Opinions* 161–181 and an index, Parts 31–51 (containing *Opinions* 161–181) have now been published. Part 52 containing the index and title page will be published as soon as possible.

VOLUME 3. This volume, which commenced with *Opinion* 182, will contain the first instalment of the *Opinions* adopted by the International Commission since their meeting at Lisbon in 1935. Parts 1–13 (containing *Opinions* 182–194) have now been published. Further Parts will be published shortly.

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN BY RICHARD CLAY AND COMPANY, LTD.,
BUNGAY, SUFFOLK.